QUAKERISM CONFIRMED,

OR

A vindication of the chief Doctrines and Principles of the people called *QUAKERS* from the arguments and objections of the *Students* of divinity (so called) of *ABERDEEN* in their book entituled

QUAKERISM CONVASSED,

By *ROBERT BARCLAY*, and *GEORGE KEITH*.

2 Tim. 3 : 9. *But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest to all men* &c.

Printed in the Year. 1676.

110. f. 240. (8)

Prayers in Latin, of their whole Eccleſiaſtical Government, and pretended Religious Orders, be allowed or recommended as Matter of Chriſtian Faith, and Diſcipline by Scripture and Antiquity?

If they are not to be found there, why ſhould any be ſo abſurd as to receive them? If they are taken thence, let them aſſign us the places both in Scripture and primative Antiquity; for the firſt three hundred years after Chriſt (and in ſome particulars much more) are wholly ſilent in the matter, any farther *then to furniſh us with pregnant Inſtances againſt thoſe idle Dotages, and groſs Superſtitions.* But,

3dly, *Whether in caſe they could not be conformed to, they would allow a* Tolleration, *were they powerful?*

4thly, *Whether in caſe they ſhould ſay* YES, *we ought to believe them? Since it's one of their moſt ſacred Maxims,* Not to keep Faith with Hereticks; *as was ſeen in the caſe of thoſe of the* Alpine *Valleys,* J. Huſ. &c. and in that they have in all Ages *brought ſo great Deluge of Blood upon the European World.*

5thly, *Whether it be the Intereſt of the* Engliſh *Nation to ſubject her ſelf to a Popiſh Yoak? Conſidering the incomparable Bloody Maſſacrees of that ſort of Men in ſeveral Reigns, with the ſpiritual Tyranny ſhe would bring upon her ſelf, which muſt end in the draining of her People to enrich the Papacy, who makes it a fundamental Maxim,* That the Enriching of the Church, (or rather the impoveriſhing of the People) is the Securing of it: *For Seculars being impoveriſht, as of old, the Church Party will have the Treaſury, and conſequently the tryumphing Power in her hands,* which brings to the antient Arrogancy *of Popes,* Viz. *Setting their Feet upon the Necks of Princes.*

6th and Laſtly, *Whether the Deſign of Popery be not an utter deſtruction of all true and ſollid Religion, and the Introduction of Formality and Superſtition; to the inſecuring of civil Authority, and putting the Peoples Judgment into the Prieſts Inquiſition?* Since the moſt *ignorant* and *careleſs,* or the moſt *vitious* and *prophane,* are generally found to be their *Proſelites*: Their *Religion* (by reaſon of its latitude in point of *Indulgence*) *being an open Sanctuary to refuge all looſe and deboiſt Livers.*

THE END.

QUAKERISM CONFIRMED,

OR

A vindication of the chief Doctrines and Principles of the people called *QUAKERS* from the arguments and objections of the *Students* of divinity (so called) of *ABERDEEN* in their book entituled

QUAKERISM CONVASSED,

By *ROBERT BARCLAY*, and *GEORGE KEITH*.

2 Tim. 3:9. *But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest to all men* &c.

Printed in the Year. 1676.

110. f. 240. (3)

Friendly Reader

Had we not more regarded the intereſt of the Truth, for whoſe ſake we can ſhun no abaſement, then the ſignificancy of thoſe, with whom we have this rencountre, we ſhould have rather chuſed to be ſilent, then anſwer them, they being of ſo ſmall reputation among their own, that neither teachers nor people will hold themſelves accomptable for any of their poſitions, and ſeeme zealous to have it believed they would not beſtow time to read it, nor yet hold themſelves obliged to approve it. However ſince we certainly know that in the ſecond part of their book (to which this reply is) they have ſcraped together moſt of the chief arguments uſed againſt us, and borrowed not a little from G. Ms. manuſcripts, (with whoſe work, that yet appears not, we have been theſe ſeven years menaced) which, like the materialls of a building managed by unskilfull workmen, though they be by them very confuſedly put together, yet being the chief things can be ſaid againſt us, we have throughly handled, for the Readers ſatisfaction, which may be ſerviceable to the Truth, without reſpect to the inſignificancy of thoſe againſt whom it is written. As for the firſt part of their book, we have alſo anſwered it, but diſtinct from this, it conſiſting of many particularityes of matters of fact, which perhaps might have proved tadious to many Readers that may by this be edified, and think it of no great conſequence, that the Students are proved lyars, which even many of their own party think is not any ſpot in their religion, ſo litle are they looked upon among their own, yet thoſe that are curious may alſo have that firſt part. As for this ſecond part, wherein our principles are handled, we judge we deal with the Clergy in generall, however they ſeek to ſhift it, and hide themſelvs, ſince their book is licenced by the biſhop of Edinburgh, and he being challenged, ſaid, he did it not without a recommendation from Aberdeen. So that no man of reaſon, can deny but they are accountable for the errours, and impertinencies which we have herein obſerved, which we leave, Reader, to thy ſerious examination, remaining

Thy Friends

R. B. G. K.

The

The CONTENTS.

SECTION 1.

Concerning immediat Revelation. Pag. 1.

SECTION 2.

The Students argument against the Spirits being the rule, proved one with the *Iesuit Dempsters*. 12

SECTION 3.

Concerning the supper, perfection, and Womens speaking. 18

SECTION 4.

Concerning the necessity of immediat Revelations to the building up of true faith. 27

SECTION 5.

Concerning Worship. 48

SECTION 6.

Concerning Baptism. 56

SECTION 7.

Concerning the Ministry. 65

SECTION 8.

Concerning Liberty of Conscience. 75

The CONCLUSION.

Wherin their observations upon *R. B. his Offer*, and their last Section of the *Q. Revileings*, as they terme them, are examined. 83

QUA-

QUAKERISM CONFIRMED,

SECTION FIRST.

Concerning immediate Revelation, wherin the Second part of the Students book from Pag. 44. to Pag. 66. is Answered,

IN their first section, they alledge, *we doe wickedly put many indignities upon the holy Scriptures, and that we monopolise the Spirit to our selves*, which are grosse lyes, but that they are against the Spirit, is no malicious accusation, but a thruth as will appear to any true discerner: Their comparing us, when wee plead for the Spirit, to them, who cryed *the Temple, the Themple*, is unequall and profane, they that cryed *the Temple, the Temple*, rejected the Spirit of God, and relyed too much on the Temple, and outward priviledges, but dare they blame any for relying too much on the Spirit of God? Again, in their first subjection they committ a grosse deceit in which they follow G. M. their master, who (useth the same in his manuscript to us) in alleadging, *they are more for the Spirit then we*, becaus they affirme, that *the efficacy of the Spirit is insuperable*. For wee doe affirme, that the efficacy of the Spirit is in a true sense insuperable, as namely wher the mind is well disposed, See R. B. his *thesis*, wher he useth the word *insuperably*, but that the Spirit doth insuperably move, or irresistibly force the *ill disposed* minds of all in whom it operats is false, and contrary to scripture, which saith, that *some resist the Spirit*, yea and is contrary to the experience of all, who are acquainted with the Spirits workings, that know, that the Spirit many tymes worketh so gently, that his operation may be resisted, therfore said the Apostle, *Quench not the Spirit*. Now that doctrine which is contrary both to Scripture, and experience

rience is not for the ſpirit, but againſt it. Again, how are they more for the ſpirit then we, ſeing they affirm *the Spirits influence is but only effective, as having no evidence in it ſelf, ſufficiently to demonſtrat that it is of God*; we ſay, it hath, as being both effective and objective. 2. They ſay, *the influence of the ſpirit is only given to ſome*; we ſay, to all. 3. They ſay, *it is ſo weak, that it can bring none to a perfect freedom from ſin in this life, though never ſo much improved*; we ſay, it can, yea. 4. They ſay commonly, *the influence of the ſpirit cannot keep the beſt Saint one moment from ſin*, we ſay, it can keep them for whole dayes, yea alwayes, if they improve it, as well as they can. 5. They ſay, *a Man may and ought to pray without the ſpirit*, which we deny, and ſo we leave it to the judicious, if here they do not commit a groſs deceit. Laſtly, in their ſtating the queſtion, they accuſe us falſely, *as if we did hold, that all men ought to judge, and examine all the materiall objects of faith and Articles of religion by inward revelations*, as if all men were bound to an impoſſibility, all men have not all the materiall objects of faith propounded unto them, for ſome of the materiall objects of faith are meerly accidentall unto all mens ſalvation, as to believe that *Abraham begat Iſaak, and Iſaak Iacob*, &c. others although not *accidentall*, yet are but *integrall parts*, and not *eſſentiall* of Chriſtian religion, ſuch as the *outward hiſtory of Chriſt*, &c. and ſo by this diſtinction divers of theſe arguments are anſwered, without more ado, eſpecially the firſt two, where they ſpend much paper fighting with their own ſhaddow, telling us, that the heathens have no revelations, *ſhewing the birth, paſſion, reſurrection, &c. of Ieſus Chriſt*, which we do grant, for the belief of ſuch things is only neceſſary to them, to whom they are propounded, and the Scriptures alledged by them, at moſt prove no more, it were a needleſs labour and not worth the pains to anſwer particularly to all their impertinencies, follies, and blaſphemies, which they obtrude upon us as arguments, and in the iſſue, their laſt probations reſolve into meer aſſertions, as much denyed by us, as the things they undertake to refute, therefore upon each ſection or ſubſection we ſhall, but take notice, what their arguments reſolve into at laſt, and as there is occaſion, ſet down ſome propoſitions that may ſerve as a key to open the Readers way, through all theſe heaps of confuſion and blaſphemy, wherewith they fill their pages. As for the Scriptures brought by them *Arg.* 1. as Iſa. 9. 2. Matth. 4. 16. Pſal. 147. 19. 20. Theſe prove not, that they had no light, for *the light ſhineth in darkneſs* Joh. 1. and Prov.

Prov.29.18. doth not import that people have wanted *viſion* from the beginning, but that for ſome time, they may want it, *to wit*, when their day of viſitation is over, which we deny not. And whereas they tell us that the Greek particle ἐν is often to be tranſlated *among*, and therefore ſo to be Col.1.26. and other places alledged by us; we deny this conſequence. And that they ſay, the Apoſtle is ſpeaking of the outward preaching of Chriſt Col.1.26. is their bare aſſertion without any proof. Alſo in their firſt argument they alledge a groſs untruth upon G. K. as if he did hold in his book of *Immediat revelation*, pag.11. that the Jewes generally under the Law had no immediat revelation in the Seed, let the place be read and it will clear G. K. where he diſtinguisheth a twofold ſort of revelation in the ſeed, according to a twofold condition of the ſeed, the firſt ſort of revelation is more hidd and obſcure, the ſeed not being compleatly formed, but as under ground. The ſecond is more manifeſt and clear, ſo as with open face to behold the glory of God. *The firſt* ſort of revelation is given univerſally unto all both Jews and Gentiles, but *the ſecond* is only given to the Saints, in whom the ſeed is compleatly formed and brought forth. As to their Queries we anſwer that *Conſcience* and *Reaſon* are diſtinguished from the *ſaving light of Chriſt in all men, & the revelation thereof*, as a naturall and ſupernaturall principle are diſtinguished, and it was the naturall, which *Pelagius* did exalt too much, as our adverſaries alſo do, who affirm that men may be lawfull preachers without being renewed by the ſupernaturall principle of Gods ſaving light and Grace.

In the proſecution of their ſecond argument. 1. They deny the inward blood and ſufferings of Chriſt, referring us to their proofe afterwards, which we ſhall in its place examine. 2. They alledge that we hold *an heavenly and ſpirituall nature in Chriſt, which is diſtinct from the Godhead on the one hand, and from the Manhood on the other*, which they call a *third nature in Chriſt*. But this their alledgance is falſe, for that heavenly and ſpirituall nature is not a third thing diſtinct from both the Godhead and Manhood of Chriſt, as ſhall be afterwards ſhown. 3. They alledge that the Apoſtle doth not ſpeak of any inward hearing or word, but of the outward. The Contrary is manifeſt from the Apoſtles own words in the ſame chapter, *the word is nigh thee in thy mouth and in thy heart*. Nor is their reaſon valid to prove it, for the words verſ.14,15. are not arguments made by Paul, but objections adduced by him, which he

afterwards answereth, and this is usuall with Paul in this Epistle. As to their question, *wherein consists the nature and essence of faith* ? we say, it is a receiving of Christ, laying hold upon *him*, according to whatsoever revelation *he* makes of *himself in mens hearts*, which is in some greater, in others less, but *in all* is in some degree.

In their third argument they undertake to prove that according to us the Scriptures are not necessary *secundum quid*, or profitable, but all in vain, as for their example, as they know *examples prove not*, so is it vain and impertinent, for we never compared the Scriptures to a mutilated and dim coppy, they are a clear and perfect coppy as to all *essentialls* and necessaries of Christian religion : but they are not the *originall* ; and seing we have answered them so many questions, let them answer us this one. *Are not all these divinity books and Commentaries on the Scripture made by men not divinely inspired, as a mutilated and dim coppy in comparison of the Scripture, and whether is the Scripture or these books more perfect* ? if they say the Scripture is more perfect, then what need they the mutilated and dim coppy of these divinity books, or what profit can they have, by them, which they cannot have rather by the Scripture? Again, here they confound the *materiall* and *formall object of faith*, as if we did hold that inward revelation without Scripture did propound unto us the *materiall objects of faith*, which is false, for there are many of the *materiall objects*, which are only propounded by the Scripture, *to witt*, such as the historicall part of the Scripture, and in this respect, we do not plead that inward revelation is the materiall object, but the formall.

In their fourth argument, they are so blind as not to take notice how we can give the same answer that they give, concerning the Law, *that we who are under grace and obedience to the inward Law, are dead as to the condemning power, but not as to the commanding power thereof*. But that it is not the letter or any outward testimony of the Law that doth so powerfully convince a mans conscience, as of other sinns, so of covetousness, as the Spirit of God doth in his inward convictions and smitings upon the conscience, is clear from the experience of all these, who have known and passed through the state, which the Apostle spake of, when he said, *I was alive without the Law, but when the commandement came, sin revived, and I died*. Yea what law is that of the mind, whereof he makes mention Rom. 8. but an *inward Law*, by which the knowledge of sin comes,

comes, and through which both the knowledge, and remembrance of ſin ſticks more cloſely to the ſoul then through any outward law it can? and did not Chriſt ſay, that the ſpirit ſhould *convince the world of ſin*? yea how many of thoſe called Heathens, who had not any outward law, have declared that inward concupiſcence was a ſin? As for their malicious accuſation againſt us, of our luſt and covetouſneſs, we reject as not worth the noticing, ſeing they aſſert it without any colour of proofe, but it ſeems they have learned that wicked and devilish maxime *calumniare audacter aliquid adhærebit*. i.e. calumniat boldly that ſomething may ſtick.

Their fifth argument is anſwered in the firſt as being a branch thereof.

Their ſixth argument is built upon a falſe ſuppoſition, that according to our principle, *all would be prophets, and that no difference could be aſſigned betwixt prophets, and paſtors and teachers, ſeing prophets and teachers teach both from the ſpirit*. The firſt is anſwered at large in the end of G.Ks. book of Immediat revelation. To the ſecond we anſwer, that by *prophets* in the ſtrickeſt ſenſe are meant thoſe who prophecy of things to come, as *Agapus* was; by *teachers*, they who inſtruct the people in doctrine, and this is a manifeſt difference, although in the large and common ſenſe prophecying and preaching are one thing.

Their ſeaventh argument, they pretend to build on that Scripture Jud.19. but it is eaſily anſwered, that men in one ſenſe may be ſaid *not to have the ſpirit*, and in another *to have it*, even as a rich man who improveth not his money, both *hath*, and *hath it not* in divers ſenſes, according to which Chriſt ſaid, *from him that hath not ſhall be taken away that which he hath*. And whereas R.B. doth grant that they whoſe day of viſitation is come to an end, *have not* the ſpirit, ſo much as to invite and call them unto God; here they inſult as if all were granted they ſeek, but they are greatly deceived, for though he grant that ſome have not the ſpirit to call and invite them, yet he granteth not that they have not the ſpirit to reprove them, for even the devils and damned ſouls of men and women ſin againſt the Spirit of God witneſſing againſt them in their hearts, which is in them a law of condemnation, as David ſaid, *if I go down into hell thou art there*, yea do we not read not only that *God ſpak unto Cain* a moſt wicked man, but alſo *unto Sathan* Job. 1. which ſpeaking of God to Sathan, we ſuppoſe the Students will not ſay, was by an out-

ward voyce, and consequently it was internall. But we ask them if all wicked Professors of Christianity should burn the Bible and destroy all outward rules and means of knowledge, *should they by this means cease to sin, because they should have no rule, or should they be excused from gospell duties, because they have no rule*, by this supposition (according to the Students) to require them?

In their second subsection they spend both their strength and paper, in labouring to prove some things which we no wise deny, as the *sequel* of their *Major* §. 14. but in the proofe of their *Minor*, where the whole stress lyeth, they utterly faill in both its branches, as we shall briefly shew. As to the first, they argue thus, *they know no such inward objective evidence of inward revelations of the spirit in themselves, therefore they have none such.* We deny the consequence, they see it not, nor know it, because they will not, their prejudice against the truth doth blind them, and indispose their understanding; yea might not the unbelieving Jews have reasoned the same way against Christ, when he was outwardly present with them, we do not know him to be Christ, Therefore he is not Christ. Again, whereas they querie in a scoffing way, *can a thing that is self evident be hidd from the whole world except a few Illuminado's?* We answer, if it were hidd from the whole world, except a few in comparison of others, it is no more then what the Scripture saith, *that the whole world lieth in wickedness*, & their wickedness blindeth them, that they do not see the light that is in them, yet we could instance many who are not *Quakers*, so called both Christians and Gentils who have acknowledged the evidence and certainty of divine inspiration in all men, as the surest ground of knowledge, but we need not digress into this here; we have enough besides to stop their mouths. For do not they say, that the Scriptures have a self-evidence, and yet are not the Scriptures and the truths declared in them hidd from the greatest part of the world? The Mahumetans reject both *Old* and *New Testament*, and the Jews the *New*; although they read them, and yet according to our adversaries, they have self evidence, so that it is evident, the same argument is as much against the Scripture, as the Light within in point of self evidence, and indeed much more, seing many who deny the self evidence of the Scirptures, even heathens have a knowledge of the self evidence of divine inspiration, as *Socrates*, *Plato*, *Plotinus*, *Phocyllides*, *Seneca* and many others. And here in the close being sensible of their weakness after they have laboured to prove the *negative*, they

they tell us, that seing the negative is theirs, they are not bound to prove it, and so would roll it over on us to prove the *affirmative* against their own law, which would have us to be meer defendents. As to the maxime, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*, it doth not help them, for they have affirmed a negative, and have been at great pains to prove it. But all in vain. And why may we not put them to prove their *Minor* being a negative, as well as their master, I. M. put the Jesuit Dempster to prove his *Minor*, which John Meinzies affirmed to be negative?

In their prosecution of the second branch they affirm that *the Q. cannot give any sufficient evidence of their revelations.* This we deny and put them to prove it, but how shamefully they fail here is apparent, for instead of proving of what they affirm, they put us to prove the contradictory, and so contrary to their own Law, would urge us to be impugners and defenders at one time, a silly trick they learned from the *Baptists* in their dispute at London, as indeed the Students argument about an evidence is the same upon the matter with that which the Baptists used against us at London long before them and which the *Iesuit* used against I.M. long before them both. So that we may see what sort of patrons the Students here follow. But it is well to be observed, that when they seek an evidence from us, they tell us pag. 57. *They mean not an evidence which will actually and* de facto *convince a pertinacious adversary, but an objective evidence or clearness in the thing it self which is* apta nata, *fitt of its own nature to convince, and will really convince the well disposed.* Very well! this their plain concession destroyeth their whole building, for seing they press upon us by way of Dilemma, *either we have the Spirit of God, or we have it not*, which is I.L. his argument. We may very lawfully by his own example press him and his fellow Students, with the like argument, *either they have a well disposed mind, or they have not.* If they say, they have not, then they confess they are a pertinacious adversary, and so not capable to be convinced of our evidence, and surely it were great folly in us to seek to convince them of the truth of a thing, who are not in a capacity to be convinced. If they say, they have a well disposed mind, then let them prove it to us, or give us an evidence of it, seing by their own rule, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* Who is so weak that doth not see that they are intangled in the same difficulty they would urge upon us, yea into a far greater, for they can not so much as pretend to any *objective evidence*, whereby to convince us that they are well disposed, seing they al-

altogether deny such a thing. If they answer, that *they are not bound to say either the affirmative or negative*, but require of us to prove the negative, who seeth not that we have the same to reply unto them, when they urge us, *either the Q. have the spirit, or they have not*, that we are not bound to say, either the affirmative or negative, for although *to have*, and *not to have*, are contradictory, yet to say, that *we have* the spirit, and that we *have not* the spirit, are not contradictory, being both affirmative: and indeed when we assert things only *in thesi*, we do not say, either *that we have*, or *have not the* spirit, but this we say, and we are able to prove from Scripture, that all good Christians *have* the Spirit of God, immediately to teach and guide them into all truth, and all men *have* it so far as either to justify or condemn them. By this we stand, and are able to defend it through the help of God, as consisting both with Scripture, and sound reason, and testimonies of Ancients. But if they think with their little craft to bring us down from the *Thesis* to the *Hypothesis*, they must know the same will bring them down to it also, for seing it is a truth acknowledged both by them and us, that all true Christians and children of God *have* the Spirit of God, working in them at lest as an *efficient cause*: from this we urge them thus, *either they have the Spirit of God working in them as an efficient cause, or they have not*. If they say, *they have not*, they confess they are not true Christians, or children of God, which we suppose they will be loath to say, if they say, *they have the Spirit of God as an efficient cause of faith working in them, and subjectively inlightening them*, let them prove it, or give us an evidence of it. Who doth not see, that poor men they are taken in their own snare? we know all rationall and sober men will acknowledge that we are not bound to receive their affirmations without proofe, more then they are bound to receive ours, nor indeed so much, we being as the case stands, but defendents.

As touching their answer to R. B. his *retortions* about an *evidence* it shall be examined in the next section.

In pag. 60. they tell, that *we assign them at last some shaddows of evidences, namely first, our own declaration. 2. the Scriptures. 3. the immediat testimony of the Spirit.* But that these are not shaddows, will appear to the judicious and well disposed, if they consider these two things. 1. That by our *declaration* we mean not a bare verball declaration, having no virtue or manifestation of life in it, for we confess, such might be as good a *ground for a heretick* in way of *evidence*, but by our *declaration*, we

we mean ſuch a declaration as doth really proceed from the ſpirit of God in us, and is therefore a living declaration having a manifeſtaaion of life in it, and with it, and which is not only in words of life, or living words uttered through us from the ſpirit of life, but alſo in works of life or living works, which are the fruits of the ſpirit, as ſaid Chriſt, *by their fruits ſhall ye know them.* Now ſuch a *declaration*, can no *Heretick have*, however he may *pretend* to it. If our adverſaries ſay, *that we only pretend to ſuch a thing.* We anſwer them with their own rule, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* i.e. The affirmer ought to prove. Let them prove us only to be pretenders, which yet they have not done, nor can do; and indeed ſuch a declaration from the Spirit of God in the Apoſtles, as when John ſaid, *we are of God*, &c. was an evidence that no heretick could juſtly pretend to; 2. it is a moſt unjuſt and unreaſonable thing to require of us any other evidence of our having the ſpirit, then that which every true Chriſtian may and ought to give, ſeing we pretend to no other *ſpirit*, but that which every true Chriſtian hath, nor to any *revelations*, but theſe, which are the priviledges of all true Chriſtians, nor to any *doctrines*, which are not conform to the Scriptures of Truth, as we are ready to prove, and as G K. hath already ſhewed in his book *Immediat Revelation*, which neither the Students nor their Maſters have given us any refutation of. Now have not all good Chriſtians, theſe three evidences for them? and we can prove by the help of the Lord that they are as applicable to us, as to any upon e rt h: and here note, that when we ſay *the Scripture is the beſt outward evidence, that can be given, we mean it not as a particular evidence*, but as a generall common to all good Chriſtians, for we grant that the Scripture cannot prove that any particular man hath the Spirit of God in ſuch a way as true Chriſtians have it, but it proves in generall, that all true Chriſtians have it, yea and all men to convince them at leaſt.

In pag. 61, 62. They reject the Scriptures teſtimonv as an evidence to us, *becauſe according to us the Scriptures teſtimony hath no evidence without the Spirit.* In anſwer to wh ch we ſay. But it hath an evidence with the ſpirit, his inward evidence going along with it, which inward evidence, we ſay, doth go along with it, ſufficiently to convince every well diſpoſed intellect. And this we can prove from the Scriptures teſtimony. Nor is this to commit an unlawfull circle, as they foolishly al edge, which is but an old threed-bare alledgance of Papiſts againſt the Proteſtants, as *Turnbull* alledged on *Paræus*, *that he proved the ſpirit by the Scripture*,

and the Scripture by the Spirit. Some Proteſtants in our dayes do miſerably ſeek to extricat themſelves of that circle, that they know the ſpirit by the Scriptures *objectively*, and they know the Scriptures by the ſpirit *effectively*, and ſo indeed they get free of the circle, as not being, *in eodem genere*, i.e. in the ſame kind. But they affirm a groſs untruth that the ſpirits influence, is only effective and *ex parte ſubjecti*, whereas we know it is *objective*, and can prove both from Scripture and primitive Proteſtants, ſee G.K. his book of *immediat Revelation*, and *Quakeriſm no popery*. Where the ſame is at length proved. But we have a moſt clear way to extricat our ſelves of that circle impoſed on us by Papiſts and theſe Students, *to wit*, that we know the Scriptures teſtimony by the ſpirit *tanquam à priori*, *as we know the effect by the cauſe*, and we know the Spirits teſtimony by the Scriptures, *tanquam à poſteriori*, as we know *the cauſe by the effect*, and ſo both are objective, and yet in a divers kind, becauſe the objective evidence of the ſpirit is a ſelf evidence and primary, the objective evidence of the Scripture is but derived and ſecondary.

In their anſwer to G.K. his retortion from the practice of Chriſt, *who though his own immediat teſtimony was to be received, referred them unto the teſtimony of the Scriptures.* They moſt miſerably betake themſelves to their old trade of affirming things without any proof, and yet on the proof of theſe things the whole ſtreſſe of their anſwer lyeth, as 1. They ſay, *the Iews rejected only the outward immediat teſtimony of Chriſt.* However dare they ſay, but that the outward immediat teſtimony of Chriſt was to be believed? and yet he referred them unto the teſtimony of the Scriptures. 2. They ſay, *they have no ſuch teſtimony themſelves as the inward objective teſtimony of the ſpirit.* 3. They ſay, *according to Chriſt, the Scriptures were the rule, meaning the primary rule*, and ſo, they ſet the Scripture above Chriſt, his own immediat outward teſtimony, a moſt groſs diſorder. All which we reject as meer affirmations without any proof. Their inſinuation *that G. K. acteth the part of a cunning ſophiſt, when he ſpoke theſe words repeated by them*, pag. 4. is no leſs without any reall proof, for it is a truth, that no Scripture truth can be ſavingly believed but by the illumination of the ſpirit, which is objective.

In paragraph 28. they think to evade G.K. his argument, *that we have inſpiration, becauſe all men have it, that then Papiſts, Mahumetans, Pagans and men bodily poſſeſſed have inſpiration*, which we do affirm, viz. that theſe have it ſo far as to convince them, and is ſufficient to be a law

of

of condemnation, and render them without excuſe for their ſin, and this all men have, not only within their day, but after their day of viſitation is expired. But as to their impoſed gloſſes and ſenſes, which they ſay their divines have already vindicated on theſe Scriptures cited by G. K. for univerſall grace and inſpiration, as they refer us to their Divines, ſo we refer them to our friends and our books, where their ſilly and weak reaſons are anſwered againſt this goſpell truth. As for the word *EVERY* we acknowledge it is not taken alwayes univerſally, but ſeing it is taken ſo moſt frequently, it lieth on them to prove that it is otherwiſe taken in the places cited.

Before we cloſe the anſwer to this ſubſection, we propoſe further unto the Reader theſe two Conſiderations. 1. That when we ſay, inward divine revelations in the ſeed are ſelf evident, we do not mean it alwayes in reſpect of the materiall objects, of things revealed, but in reſpect of the formall object, or revelation it ſelf. 2. Although we affirm that the illumination and influence of the ſpirit, in mens hearts, is both *effective* and *objective*, yet we do not affirm that they are two diſtinct things, but one and the ſame thing under different reſpects; ſo that we do not plead for another influence, then that which in words they ſeem to grant, but we ſay, it is a more excellent thing then they acknowledge it to be, as being in it ſelf perceptible and having a ſelf evidence, whereas they will have it only a *medium incognitum*, a thing altogether undiſcernible and inevident of it ſelf, ſo as to convince or ſatisfie the underſtanding that it is of God. And thus according to our adverſaries ſenſe, and upon their principle, this inward illumination of the ſpirit may be ſaid to be fallacious, for want of evidence, ſeing according to their own argument *that which hath not a ſufficient evidence is fallacious.*

But whereas the Students in their account grant in words, *that the ſoul hath ſpirituall ſenſations and that the work of grace may be felt*, this confeſſion deſtroyeth their wholl ſuperſtructure; for if the work of grace can be felt or is perceptible then it is *objective*, for whatever is perceptible is objective, ad ſeing they grant that the ſoul hath ſpirituall ſenſations, we ask them, what are the objects of the ſenſations? Are they only words and letters, or things ſuch as God himſelf in his heavenly refreshings, waterings and bedewings, if the firſt, it is moſt unreaſonable, for it would make the ſpirituall ſenſes to fall short of the naturall, ſeing the naturall ſenſes reach beyond words to naturall things themſelves, if the ſecond, they muſt

needs with us acknowledge *inward objective revelations*, for by them we understand no other thing but as God, and the things of His Kingdom are felt in us *by way of object*.

SECTION SECOND.

Where the Students chief argument against the spirits being the rule, is proved to be one upon the matter with that the Jesuit Dempster used against their Master I.M. and the same way answered, and their weak endeavours to evite it examined and refuted.

THere hath enough been said heretofore to demonstrat the fallacies in the form of their arguments in which also it resembled the *Iesuits*, which to avoid repetition we shall now omit. Their *medium* against us, is, *that we cannot give an evidence of our being led by the spirit, but that which may be as good an evidence for Hereticks*, for thus they word it in their account, alledging we wronged them, in saying, they used the words, *which Hereticks may pretend to*, yet abstracting from this false charge, we shall take is as they now express it, being indeed equivalent. To prove that it may be as good an evidence for hereticks, they make I. L. argue thus, *other Hereticks declare and say, they have the Spirit of God, teaching them as well as you. Therefore, if your saying you were so taught, were a sufficient evidence*, &c. *Then their declaring*, &c. Now let the Reader judge, whether this argument amounts to any thing more, then that, that is not a sufficient evidence to the Q. which other Hereticks may pretend to. Thus the Students dispute against the Q. let us hear how the Jesuit disputes against I. M. their Master *Pap. Lucif.* pag. 3. after the Jesuit hath repeated his argument, he adds, „ *May it please the answerer of this syllogism to remember that the ground* „ *or principle which he shall produce to prove the truth of his religion must* „ *have this property, that it cannot serve nor be assumed to prove a false* „ *religion as the grounds and principles that one produceth to prove that* „ *he is an honest man must have this property, that it cannot serve nor be* „ *assumed to prove a knave to be an honest man. &c.* Let the judicious Reader consider whether there be any materiall difference betwixt these

two

two argumentations. But to proceed and shew that their arguments are no better then the Jesuits against their Master, and our answers no worse, then their Masters against the Jesuit; we shall place them together,

I. M. answereth the Iesuit thus pag. 5. of his Pap. Lucifugus.

„ *The true religion hath sufficient*
„ *grounds in it self, to manifest it*
„ *self to be the true religion, if it*
„ *met with a well disposed intellect*
„ *(for to use your own similitude) an*
„ *honest man may have ground*
„ *enough to shew a distinction be-*
„ *twixt him and a knave, albeit a*
„ *fool cannot discern it, so the true*
„ *religion may have ground enough*
„ *to prove it self true (which the*
„ *false religion hath not) though an*
„ *infidell or Heretick whose foolish*
„ *mind is darkened Rom. 1. 21. can-*
„ *not take, it up.*

Our Answer to the Students as themselves acknowledge it pag. 59. 15.

That the evidence of the spirit cannot be assigned, but to the well disposed understandig. This they call a pitifull subterfuge, alledging that then this evidence can only be assigned to such, as are of the Q. mind, but not to others, and that any Heretick in the world may deny evidences upon the same account. Now let the judicious Reader, determine whether if this answer be a pitifull subterfuge; the Students with the same breath do not declare their Masters, to the Jesuit to be the same.

And when they write next, let them shew the difference, which they have not yet done.

In answer to this Retortion, they alledge pag. 67. *That R. B. said their master, to. M would not assign the Iesuit a ground, to prove the truth of the Protestant Religion, and therefore*, say they, *R. Bs. practices agree exactly with the Iesuits Moralls, and gives an egregium specimen of his Iesuiticall honesty, which makes us suspect him to be a Iesuited emissary.* This is a false claime disproved by their own account, where pag. 8. upon this occation, *They confess R. B said only that their master desired the Iesuit to prove that the Protestant Religion had no ground for it.* Will they deny this, let them read the very first four lines of their masters first answer to the Jesuits paper pag. 3. and they will find he put the Jesuit to prove his *Minor*, which was, that *the Protestant Religion had no such ground.* As

it doth not therefore follow that I. M assigned not afterwards a ground; so neither will R.B. his repeating this, infer that he said, he did not assign such a ground. Yea in contradiction to themselves pag. 60. They acknowledge he told, their master named *the Scripture as a ground*, &c. So it is manifest they have given here a *specimen of their Iesuiticall honesty*, and because they could not answer, they forged lyes to fill up the paper, and things not to the purpose as pag. 57. where offering to reply to this retortion, they say: *But for answer it is well known R. B. was brought up in a Popish Colledge, & it is thought by many that he is a Iesuited emissary*, &c. Is not this a pungent answer? Reader, R.B. was educated in a popish colledge; *ergo*, say the Students, *our answer is not that which the Iesuit used against our master*. It seems the Students are offended that R.B. hath forsaken popery, or otherwise their charging him with his education must be very impertinent, as indeed it is no less foolish, then if we should upbraid Luther, Calvin and all the first Reformers as Papists, for being so educated, and though it is no wonder their folly and malice led them into this impertinency, yet it might have been expected that their gratitude to the Bishop of Edinburgh, who was pleased to permitt their book to be printed, might have hindered them from this folly, seing he was educated in the same Popish Colledge R. B. was, and owes some of his Philosophy to it, wheras R. B. learned only there a litle grammar, and came thence in his 15 Year, but the Bishop was there professing popery in his more mature age. So if this reflect any thing upon R. B. it will much more against the Bishop, which they will do well to clear, and be sure not to omitt, when they write next, or else acknowledge their impertinency herein. It seems they wanted strength of reason, to evite the retortion, which makes them thus rove, offering also to prove *that their master did assigne a ground*, which was never denyed and that *he was defendent*, so was R. B. also. what is that to the purpose, unless to make the retortion the stronger, and show they cannot get by it? but pag. 60. They say, *that wheras the Iesuit pressed their master that hereticks did say, their Religion was conforme to the Scripture, as well as he, and so the Scripture was no peculiar ground for him, more then for hereticks*. They say their master answered, *That it was not a pretended, but reall conformity unto the Scripture, that demonstrats a true Religion, &c.* and upon this they inquire, what followes, alledging *they argued from being as good and not pretending*, and so fall a railling, saying, *that the light of our* Consciences *is ecclipsed by a new found*

found light, and that we misrepresent them malitiously. This railing is for want of better reasoning, but seing they are so blind as not to see, whether they will see it or not, wee shall tell them, and, wee hope, let the Reader see, what followes here from. Jo. Meinzies the Students master saith to the Jesuit, *it is not enough that hereticks say the Scripture is a ground for their Religion, unlesse it really be so, and that other Hereticks saying so doth not inferre, that it is as litle a ground for his owne* (to witt J. Ms.) *Religion.* Very well! The Quakers tell the Students, That it is not enongh that hereticks declare they have the Spirit, unlesse it be really so, and their saying, they have it, while they have it not, doth not inferre, that our saying we have it, is as litle a ground for us. Who but such as are as childish as the Students, will affirme, there is here any difference? But further, they confound most ignorantly the *Internall testimony of the spirit with the declaration of having the spirit*, which are two different things. It was incumbent upon them to have proven that the internall testimony of the spirit is as good an evidence for Hereticks, as for us, which they have not offered to do; next, they have not proved that the declaration of Hereticks is as good as ours, neither can they unless they can prove ours to be false, which they neither have nor can do. But they have egregiously falne in that inconvenience, they would fix upon us, pag. 58. 59. where in answering R.Bs. retortion, shewing them, *that if mens being deceived, contradicting themselves, or one another, who say the spirit is the rule, did infer the spirit not to be a certain rule, then mens being deceived, contradicting themselves and one another, who say the Scripture is the rule, would the same way infer that the Scripture is not the rule.* Here they are miserably put to it, and therefore not ashamed to deny that *they plead not against the spirits being a rule, for these Causes.* The contrary for which is known to all that are acquainted with these controversies, & for example, let them read their so much applauded *W. Mitchell his Dialogue* and *his sober answer*, so called, where he makes this the chief cause, yea themselves for the same reason within two pages to wit pag. 60. and 61. plead against the teachingof the spirit, affirming that * *because the Georgians, Familists and pretended Saints as Francis and Loyola, &c. pretended the inward*

* *But besides, will not their Masters answer above mentioned meet well with them here, that since these sects and saints, did as both they and the Q. confess but pretend to the spirit, that because they did but pretend therefore the Q. do but pretend also, no more then because some hereticks do pretend their religion is conform to the Scripture, therefore I. M. doth so too.* teach-

teaching of the ſpirit, and had an outward show of godlineſs, therefore the ſpirits teaching to deny ungodlineſs is as good an evidence for them as for the
Q. Who but the Students would run themſelves into ſuch miſerable conditions? but to give the Reader an evident demonſtration of the Students gift of contradicting themſelves, take one here in their own words, *they* ſay *this above mentioned retortion doth not meet their argument*, why? do we *conclude that the ſpirit is not the rule of faith, becauſe they cannot give an evidence which will actually convince, that they are led by the ſpirit, no ſuch thing*, compare this with I.Ls. medium of his ſecond argument, where he undertaketh to prove that *the ſpirit is not the rule of faith*, (as it is expreſſed by themſelves) *becauſe there can be no evidence given of it in the world*, but if they think to creep out here, that there may be evidences given, though not ſuch as do actually convince, becauſe of the want of ſubjective evidence, or diſpoſition of the mind, as they afterwards add, and that we can give no evidence, of this laſt ſort, it remains then for them to prove that their minds are well diſpoſed, ſeing they are the Opponents, and we the meer Defendents, and that the evidences aſſigned by us, or ſuch as are not manifeſt even to the well diſpoſed, and yet to go round, pag. 59. paragraph. 19. *They account this of the well diſpoſed mind ridiculous, though it was the beſt anſwer their Maſter could give the Ieſuit in the like caſe*, as above is shown, but thou may perhaps judge Reader, that theſe that are ſo nice and ſcrupulous in receiving evidences from others, would give ſome very ſolid ones for their own rule; when preſſed the ſame way to give us an evidence, that they have the Scripture to be their rule from God, and that they have the true ſenſe of it. Take then notice of them here Reader, and ſee how ſatisfactory their anſwer is Now (ſay the Students pag. 59.) *The ſolution is eaſy, for they who make the Scripture their principall rule are either our Churches, or they are Sects diſſenting from us. If the firſt, have not our divines frequently proved both from the intrinſick characters of Divinity that appear in the Scriptures themſelves, and alſo from the outward motives of credibility, that we have theſe Scripturall revelations from God? and have they not often aſſigned ſufficient objective evidences and proofs of the ſenſes of the Scriptures taught by our churches as to every point controverted by us, and all Sects whatſoever, ſo that diſenters remain unconvinced for want of ſubjective evidence and diſpoſition of mind; and really ought to believe us teaching ſuch ſenſes of Scripture*, &c. Is not this rarely well ſolved? do the Students give any better evidence for

all

all this, then their own declaration, and is not this (according to themſelves) as good for other Hereticks as for them? is it not ſtrange with what confidence they ſhould print ſuch ſtuff? Beſides as to the firſt part of it, it is manifeſtly falſe, for Calvin the chiefeſt of their Divines, hath in plain words aſſerted.

That all the objective evidences & motives of credibility are not ſufficient to eſtabliſh the Conſcience in the beliefe of the Scripturs certainly, & that therunto is neceſſary the ſecret and inward teſtimony of the Spirit, yea that the ſame Spirit that was in the Prophets and Apoſtles enter into the heart &c. So ſay all the publick confeſſions of the Proteſtants abroad, and ſeing of this according to the Students ther can be no objective evidences in the world given, then neither can there of the Scripture, which they confeſſe is their rule. So the Reader may ſee that their work is like the vipers brood, that deſtroyeth it ſelfe; & tends to overturne the certainty of all Chriſtian religion, landing in Scepticiſme, which becaus they can not ſhun, they end their ſection in vaine boaſting & railing, ſaying, pag. 77. *they provoke all the Papiſts & Qu. of the world to argue againſt them ſo, if they can.* Here are high words indeed, but ſeing they are ſo buſy in boaſting we accept the Challenge & offer us to prove before as publick an auditory, as the laſt Diſpute was, that their arguments againſt the Q. are no better then the Ieſuits againſt their maſter. And here to conclude, they adde, *Let the Reader therfore judge, whether railing Robin ſhewes forth more of an aſſes then of a vipers nature, where he brands our argument with the black mark of Popery.* Well! wee leave to the Readers judgment, who alſo may judge, if this be not railing, and if the Students, who talk at this rate, be to be truſted in their Preface, ſaying that *they have abſtained from all perſonall criminations*, and *have not rendered evil for evil*, and what may be thought of men that are not aſhamed thus to belye themſelves.

SECTION THIRD.

Wherin the Students arguments concerning the Supper, and againſt Perfection, and Womens ſpeaking are conſidered and anſwered, contained in their ſubſection 3. from pag. 66. of their book to pag. 78.

FIrſt, They ſay, *They might argue that the Q. have not revelations from the Spirit, becaus of their mad & impious practices*, and then they turne this aſſertion into a queſtion, aſking, *have not the Q. committed ſuch practices, ſaying they were commanded by the Spirit?* And for this they referrre the Reader to ſeverall bookes writ againſt the Q. by their declared adverſaries: which ſignifie nothing unleſſe they will prove that theſe men ſpake Truth, which they neither have, nor can do, and ſo are no more valued by us, then *Cochleus* lyes againſt *Luther*. But to confirme this, They place at large a citation out of H. More, whom they ſay, *the Q. have reported to be a Quaker.* This is a falſe calumny, which they are dared to prove. That H. More hath in a letter to G.K. owned ſome of the Q. principles, is true, as particularly that of immediat objective Revelation, called by them *the head of the Monſter*, and that the ſeed is a ſubſtance, which *they count one of the Q. grand errours.* As for that citation of H. More, he wrot it upon truſt, and was not an eye-witneſs of theſe things, and it recurrs upon him and them to prove the things true. The ſtory there mentioned of I. N. ſeing it was at that very time diſowned by the Q. and ſince condemned by himſelf; militats nothing againſt us, no more then other horrid things, yea that (which in the Students own eſteem) is down right treaſon, being done by ſome of the chief of their Miniſtry, as commanded by the Scripture, doth againſt them. In concluſion they give a proverb uſed by Will. Dundas, in a book of his, as a further inſtance, which they call a bundle of ridiculous and non-ſenſicall expreſſions. But will they deny but the Presbyterian Generall aſſembly of which W. Dundas ſo writs, was a *mingle mangle of omni-gatherums*, particularly that aſſembly that excommunicated and gave to the devil B. Spotſwood, and theſe other called reverend Prelats of the Church the Students own, or let the Students tell us, whether

whether in their eſteem they deſerve a better deſignation. Now that to uſe proverbs in things written even from the ſpirit of truth, is no inconſiſtency, let them read Tit. 1. 12. *evill beaſts, ſlow bellyes*, 2 Pet. 2. 22. *the dog is returned*, &c. *and the ſow to the puddle.* But to proceed, they offer to prove, the ſpirit in the Q. not to be the Spirit of God, *becaus it teaches doctrines, contrary to the Scriptures.* Their firſt inſtance of this, is, *the Q. denying the neceſſity of the continuance of the uſe of Bread and Wine, as an Ordinance in the Church, which they alledge pag. 67. is commanded Matth. 26. 26. Mark 14. 21. Luk. 22. 19.* But the Students may look over theſe places, and find if they can any thing in the firſt two of Matth. and Mark like a command, but only a meer narrative of the matter of fact. in that of Luk, theſe words are added, *do this in remembrance of me.* They proceed to prove that this is not ceaſed, of its own nature, carping at theſe words of R. B. (in his firſt anſwer to W.M. pag. 54, 55.) where he ſaith, the very inſtitution intimats the abolishing thereof at Chriſts coming, inſinuating as if he had miſtaken himſelf, *for his words* (ſay they) *allude to Pauls* 1 Cor. 11. *and not to Chriſts*, but while they take a liberty to judge of his thoughts, they do but shew their own forwardneſs to miſtake; for either theſe words of Chriſts in *Luke* above mentioned, do import, *they ſhould do that in remembrance of him untill he came*, or they *do not*, if they do not, the Students give away their own cauſe. If they do, then he might allude to that, as being there included, though not expreſſed.

They urge, *the coming of Chriſt mentioned, muſt be his coming to judgement, becauſe theſe to whom Chriſt was come in Spirit do uſe it*, but this proves not, that they then practiced it by way of neceſſary duty, more then their practicing other things, which our Adverſaries themſelves do acknowledge do not continue, nor are not binding. But they proceed pag. 69. to prove *it commanded ſince, from the Apoſtles words* 1 *Cor.* 11. And to prove that this was not a meer narrative of a matter of fact (as we truly affirm) but a command, they affirm firſt. *That he often gives the title of the Lords Supper to it, even as received by thoſe Corinthians.* For anſwer, the Students muſt needs be like themſelves, and as they often belyed us, ſo they uſe the Apoſtle the ſame way, for not only in this Chapter or Epiſtle, but in all Pauls Epiſtles, theſe words (*the Lords Supper*) are only once mentioned, ſo not often. Secondly, vers 20. where he uſeth their words, thus, *When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat*

the Lords Supper, it is ſo far from making for them, that it makes clearly againſt them, for the Apoſtle clearly here aſſerts that the Corinthians in their uſeing of bread and wine *did not eat the Lords Supper*, he ſayes not they did not eat it, as they ought. Secondly they urge, that *the Apoſtle received of the Lord a command to take, eat, do this.* This is ſtrongly alledged, but we deny it, and let them prove it, for proof, they give none, unleſs we may take an example for a proof in which they beg the queſtion, for unleſs *that alledged minion of the King* ſhould tell theſe citizens he came to, that he had received order to command them to obey the decree repeated by him, the example ſayes nothing; but that the Apoſtle has ſignified any ſuch thing to us we deny, & it remains for them to prove.

And the Syriack coppy hath not in that 20. ver. nor elswhere, theſe words *the Lords Supper* at all, but in lieu of it, *when then ye meet together not as ye ought to do in the day of the Lord.*

Thirdly, they alledge, *that ſince the Apoſtle reproves them for abuſes in the uſe of this, and to rectifie thoſe, brings them back, to the inſtitution, the duty of receiving it, may be much more concluded from the ſame inſtitution.* Anſwer, this is their bare affirmation, the abuſes committed in practicing a ceremony may be regulated by telling the proper riſe, uſe and end of it, and yet the uſing it may not be an abſolute duty, the Apoſtle ſayes how thoſe that obſerve dayes, ought to do it to the Lord, it will not therefore follow, that the obſervation of dayes, is a duty incumbent upon all, yea the Apoſtle in that place expreſly aſſerts the contrary. Their fourth reaſon is yet more ridiculous, *the Apoſtle inſinuates that it is a duty, becauſe of the firſt word FOR that which I have*, &c. Who but the Students would argue at this rate? ſuch kind of reaſons ſerve to shew their folly not to confirm their opinions, as do theſe that follow with their old example of the Kings minion. In all which they miſerably begg the queſtion, taking for granted *that it is a ſtanding ſtatut, which is the thing remains to them yet to prove.* In the end of this page they *deſire to join the word OFTEN, which* ſay they, *evidenceth it was a practice to be continued in.* And here they inſult, becauſe that R.B. in anſwer to W.M. arguing thus from this word *Often*, did reply, that thence it would not follow, that *as often* as a man ſins he offends God, did import, we should ſin *often*; here they ſay R.B. *egregiouſly shows his folly and impiety, becauſe they never did argue from the word OFTEN preciſely*, but their brother W. M. to whom he then anſwered, did preciſely argue from it, whoſe expreſs words

words in his pretended *ſober anſwer* are pag. 92. it may be obſerved *that the Corinthians were to be often in the uſe of it, becauſe it is ſaid, as often as yee eat*, &c. So ſince he argued from the word *often*, his anſwer was proper, nor have they brought any thing to weaken it. And whereas they add, *who will ſay, that ever ſin was inſtituted by God?* R. B. never ſaid ſo, but yet, that weakens not his retortion, nor ſtrengthens their argument, from the word *often* as may appear in a thing truly inſtituted by God and yet lawfull, elſe as often as a man marrieth, he is bound to his wife might be ſaid to import, that it were a duty incumbent upon men to marry, often or unlawfull to forbear. Their fifth reaſon is, becauſe *the Apoſtle preſcribes the right method of uſeing it*, for they alledge, *if it had been indifferent, he would have rather forbidden it as uſeleſs*, &c. This is no argument, but their bare conjecture, in which they would be wiſer then the Apoſtle, and we have anſwered it before, ſhewing the Apoſtle gives rules to rectifie the obſervation of dayes, which yet imports not a duty to obſerve them. Their laſt and chiefeſt reaſon is, as they ſay, *the Apoſtls expreſſe command for it, let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat*, the Students affirm, (and do but affirm) that to ſay, *this is only a permiſſion is a deſperat ſhift*, let us hear how they prove it. *Let a man examine himſelf, this is without doubt a command, therefore let him eat muſt be a command alſo*, we deny this conſequence, and it remains for them to prove it, and though this were enough in ſtrictneſs, yet we ſhall give a reaſon of our deny all: becauſe their propoſition (whatever it may be do in ſome caſes) holds not univerſally true, as to inſtance from an example or two, *let a man marry in the Lord, and ſo let him marry.* The firſt is a command here, but not the ſecond, *let a man ſpeak in religious things as the oracle of God, and ſo let him ſpeak.* The firſt is a command, but not the ſecond, many more might be named, which import only a conditionall command, not that there is a neceſſity upon all to marry, or upon all to preach, but if a man marry let him do it in the Lord, and if a man preach, let him do it *as the Oracle of God.* Alſo ſee a moſt plain example of this Rev. 22. 11. *he that is filthy let him be filthy ſtill*, and *he that is juſt, let him be juſt ſtill*, they are both in the imperative mood, yet the one is a duty, the other but a permiſſion not morall and poſitive, but phyſicall and negative; ſo if a man partake of the ceremony *of bread and wine, let him examine himſelf*, ſeing then their propoſition holds not univerſally true, it remains for them to prove that in this particular place it is ſo.

They beſtow their 34. paragraph pag. 70,71. to no purpoſe, in miſſing the controverſy, for whatever we underſtand by the ſubſtance, *which whoſo enjoyeth needs not the shaddow.* We do not deny but theſe that had the ſubſtance made uſe of the shaddow at times, for Paul *puriſied himſelf according to the Law of Moſes*, after he had been long an Apoſtle, but the queſtion is, whether that oblige us now. This the Students have forgott to prove, and will do well to advert to it when they publish their next volumne, omitting needleſſe homilies not to the purpoſe. And thus we hope the Reader may ſee, that the things we bring to prove this ceremony is ceaſed, are not shaddowes; but rather, that what they bring to confirme it, is nothing but shaddowes.

Pag. 71. They go about to anſwer an argument uſed by R. B. againſt this ceremony, drawn from the Apoſtls words 1 Cor. 16:16. in his firſt anſwer to W.M. p:54. where he shews that ſince the bread is but one, which muſt needs be the inward; the outward muſt be ceaſed, and to this they anſwer, ſaying, *the true & genuine ſenſe of the place, is, to go on as they were dictating, & not diſputing without adding any probatiou.* But ſecondly they proceed, ſaying, *that ſeing the one bread is the ſaints, though the Apoſtles were truely this one bread, yet Chriſt inſtituted his ſupper, without any contradiction, or making them not one bread.* For anſwer, were that practice of Chriſt, of the nature they would have it, then ſhould they ſay ſome thing, but while they ſuppoſe it ſo, and argue from it, they do but begg the thing in controverſie, for the Apoſtles both then and after that time uſed many legall and typicall obſervations, and yet they would argue ill, that would inferre from thence, becaus they did ſo, and that without contradiction to their being Chriſtians and under the Goſpel diſpenſation, we ought to do ſo too, as for that bread ſpoken by the Apoſtles in the 16 and 17 verſes, *we acknowledge it to be the Spirituall bread, to wit, the Spirituall body of Chriſt, of which the ſaints feed, which makes them one, and is one with them as the Apoſtle himſelfe wordeth it.* ver. 17. Now what ſignifieth all this to prove that the outward bread is the one bread? Hear how the Students evince it: but Thirdly wee ſay *That the one bread ſpoken of ver. 17. is both the outward and the inward bread, yet but one Sacramentally, and is not this rarely well argued*, we the Students ſay ſo: as to the reaſon afterwards inſinuated as Chriſt ſaith of the bread that it is his body, they should have showne how it followes. Chriſt, as Proteſtants well argue againſt Papiſts,

calls himſelf *a door, a Rock*, &c. what then? is *Chriſt and a Rock one, Chriſt and a door one door*? Let them ſhew us, if they can, in all the N. T. ſo much as one word of this figment of a Sacramentall or ſymbolicall union. and wheras upon this occaſion *R. B.* argued in his *Truth cleared of Calumnies* Pag. 54. that if the outward bread were to be called the one bread, as ſignifying it, The ſacrifices of the Law might be called one, with the one offering of Chriſt mentioned, Hebr. 10:14 and ſo continued, *This* they ſay *ſignifies nothing becaus theſe are abrogated*: then untill they prove this continues by vertue of a Goſpell command, which they have not as yet done, the ſame reaſon will hold againſt it.

To another Reaſon given of the discontinuance of this ceremony, from Gal. 2: 16. *Let no man judg you in meats, or drinks*, They ſay firſt, *that then it had not been lawfull for the Apoſtle, to have reprehended the Corinthians for the abuſes in this matter*; This is a poor ſhift indeed, though they ſhould not have been reprehended for laying it aſide altogether, yet ſeing they uſed it as a religious duty, they might well be reprehended, if they did it not religiouſly. Secondly, They ſay, *that then gluttony &c. ought not to be reproved, & that the Q. ere they miſſe to pull down Chriſts ordinance will make way for gluttony & drunkenneſſe.* Anſwer, Here is but a ſilly malitious reflexion in ſtead of a reaſon, The Apoſtle is ſpeaking here, as the St. themſelves afterwards acknowledge, *of meats & drinks uſed in religious acts*, & if the propoſition hold true in this reſpect, it will anſwer the end, & not of naturall eating &c. Thirdly. They ſay, *It muſt only be underſtood of the Legall ceremonyes, becaus of the* 14 verſe, *asking if the Lords ſupper was contrary unto us, or was nailed to the Croſſe*? what then? The Students are over haſtie & ſhould have looked to the 21 & 22. verſes, *Touch not, taſt not, handle not, which all are to perish with the uſeing*; & do not bread & wine which perish in the uſeing, & are therefore here included; as for the abſurdity inſinuated by them, *how could that be nailed to the croſſe, that was but inſtituted two dayes before*? will they ſay *that abſtaining from things ſtrangled, & from blood was nailed to the croſſe* which was commanded long after Chriſt was crucified? And yet ſome of their Divines (as they call them) uſe this Scripture for a repeale of it.

Their ſecond charge againſt the Q. and to prove they are not led by the Spirit, is becaus *they aſſert a poſſibility of not ſinning upon earth* which they ſay, is expreſſly contrary to the Scripture, as firſt to Iſaiah 64: 6 *we*

are

are all an unclean thing. All our righteouſneſs are as filthy raggs. But they should have proven that the Prophet ſpeakes here not only of the Legall righteouſneſſe of the Iewes, but even of the righteouſneſſe wrought by Chriſt in the regenerate under the Goſpell, which they have not ſo much as attempted to do and therefore prove nothing, yea the chiefeſt of their Divines as *Calvin*, *Muſculus*, *Correus* deny this place to be underſtood of the rightouſneſſe of the Saints under the goſpell, but only of the legall righteouſneſſe of the Iewes, whom we leave them to refute or reconile themſelves to, and procced to their ſecond argument, from the words of the Prayer, *Forgive us our ſins*, but men may pray for forgiveneſſe of ſins paſt, though they ſin not daily, and this is the thing in queſtion; likewiſe this argument drawn from theſe words, doth militat no leſſe againſt perfect juſtification, then it doth againſt perfect ſanctification, as G.K. hath at more length in his *Quakeriſm no Popery* in anſwer to their maſter J.M. Pag. 41. They argue from the words of the Apoſtle Paul, Rom. 7. 18. 20 &c. *To will is preſent with me &c.* but they ſhould have proven that the Apoſtle wrote of his own preſent condition, and not as perſonating the condition of others, for the Apoſtle in the ſame 7 chap. ver. 14. ſaith of himſelf, *but I am carnall, ſold under ſin* but who will ſay that the Apoſtle as to his own preſent condition was then carnall? or if he was, was there no ſpirituall men then? or was he none of them? But fourthly they urgee 1 Jo. 1: 8. *If we ſay we have no ſin, we deceive our ſelve &c.* and here they are offended R.B. ſhould ſay this is conditionall, like the 6 verſe, which they confeſſe is ſo, for, ſay they, at the ſame rate he might alledge all the reſt of the verſes of the epiſtle to be conditionall, but if it referre, or allude particularly to the 6. ver. the reaſon will hold as to it, though not of the reſt, that both they and the reſt of the verſes of this chapter do allude to the fifth, the ſuppoſition *if* ſo often repeated, doth ſhew, they are angry that R.B. ſhould alledge *WE* here doth not include John more, then the Apoſtle James 3. 9. *with the tongue curſe we men*, doth include James. For firſt the Students will have James here included, alledging it is ſpoken of excommunication, and here they take occaſion to upbraid R. B. with ignorance, in eccleſiaſticall diſcipline, but ſurely they have been either dreaming or doting when they ſo wrot, for hade they read the following verſe they might have obſerved the Apoſtle condemning this curſing, ſaying, *theſe things ought not ſo to be*, and we ſuppoſe they judge not their Eccleſiaſticall diſcipline to be unlawfull; but being

being it ſeems aſhamed of this ſhift, they give another interpretation which deſtroyeth their owne cauſe, alledging James might have underſtood it of himſelfe, before his converſion, while perhaps he was a curſer. Very well, then let them give us a reaſon, why the Apoſtle John might not alſo have underſtood *If w. ſay &c.* of himſelfe alſo before his converſion; but are not theſe, thinkeſt thou Reader, learned Divines, who to evite the ſtrength of a Scripture, give it within the compaſſe of one page two contradictory expoſitions, affirming them both, and yet if the one be true, the other muſt be falſe; and then can ſhake them both off, alledging, they may render the word by way of interrogation, *and do we therefore curſe men?* Are not theſe rare interpreters, becaus the Apoſtle uſeth an interrogation elſewhere in this chapter, therefor this may be ſo done alſo, but what then becometh of their church diſcipline and other interpretation? Theſe muſt be shutt out of dores. Are not theſe like to be ſtable preachers, who give three different interpretations to one text; if any one of which be true, the other two can not be admitted? It ſeems theſe young men think to make a quick trade of the Bible, *cauponari verbum Dei*, who can thus play faſt & looſe with it at pleaſure. But to proceed, they alledge Eccleſiaſt. 7:20. *There is not a juſt man upon earth that doth good, and ſinneth not*; this argument is built upon an errour of the tranſlation, it ſhould be tranſlated, *who may not ſin*, *qui non peccet*, ſo *Iunius* and *Tremellius*, *Vatablus*, the vulgar Latine, and almoſt all the Interpreters have it, and our English tranſlation Pſal. 119. ver. 11. tranſlateth the ſame Hebrew word ſo, being in the ſame tenſe, which is the ſecond future: *I have hid thy word in my heart, that I may not ſinn againſt thee.* A ſecond place Ja. 3.2. *In many things we offend all*, what then? it followeth not thence that we offend at all times, or we can never but offend, which is the thing under debate; but to conclude, they confeſs, we have other exceptions, which themſelves, it ſeems, take no notice of, becauſe, they are ſolidly refuted by their Divines, and therefore (ſay the Stud.) the Q. herein *teach a doctrine contrary to the revelations of Gods Spirit in the Scriptures.* Anſw. A quick way to diſpatch controverſies indeed, if it could hold, but at preſent it may ſerve to shew the St. folly, not to refute our principles, if their Divines have already done the buſineſs ſo ſolidly, might not they have ſpared their labour, which ſome of their own think had been their wiſdome.

Their third inſtance againſt the Q. is pag. 74. their allowing of women

to preach, alledging *it is directly contrary to* 1 Cor. 14.34, 35. *Let your women keep silence, &c.* and 1 Tim. 2.12. *Let the woman learn in silence, &c.* Here to begin like themselves, they say G.K. *is too much addicted to women*, but they are dared if they can to produce any reall ground for this malitious insinuation G. K. besides the testimony of a good conscience hath the testimony of hundreds, who have known his manner of life and conversation from his childhood to this day, that it hath been honest and of good report, so that he feareth not, that the lying reports, which the malice of his adversaries may raise, can hurt him, yet these are men that solemnely professe they have abstained from personall Criminations, but seing they have belyed the Apostle Paul, as is above observed, G.K. may take it patiently to be treated at this rate by men of such circumstances, but if they think to inferre it, because G.K. doth plead for the liberty and priviledge of women, they might as well plead, that G. K. is too much addicted to a perfect holiness, because he doth plead for it, or that the Students are too much addicted to sin, since they plead for the continuance of it for term of life. They are little lesse then inraged, that G. K should have alledged the testimony of *Augustine* and *Bernard* interpreting this place of the flesh, and therefore they labour like men in a sweat, for a whole page against this to no purpose, the only reason of G. Ks. citing them, being because some of their preachers cryed out against this allegory, as a horrid abusive thing in some Q. to shew them it, is none of the Q. coining, but already used by men by themselves applauded and commended, upon this they ask, *have not some of our Antagonists been observed to make a Wilshmans hose of the first chapter of Genesis*, if they mean us, let them prove we have so done, as we have already proved, they have used the Apostle James with their three faced interpretatian, and again they ask, *have not some Q. been bold to aver, that there was never any such reall tree as the tree of knowledge of good and evill*, if they have, let them instance and prove by whom it was spoken, and writ and then they shall have an answer. As they proceed they give an egregious specimen of their folly, alledging, that *if it did hold*, (as G.K. affirms) *that women are not allowed to speak by permission, then à fortiori, it is unlawfull for them to speak by commandement.* Who but the Students would talk at this rate, as if a commandment might not authorize a man to do that, which a bare permission will not. G. Ks. arguments drawn from their own allowing whores to speak, and women to sing, they call quibles, because they can

not

not anſwer, which they reply to only by queſtions, *do they allow whores authoritative preaching, affirming women may ſing?* Very well, whether it be authoritative or not, whatſoever way they ſpeak, they keep not ſilence, and ſo the Apoſtls words are not taken ſtrictly, and literally, which gaines us the cauſe, and shewes our doctrin is no more directly againſt the Apoſtls words then their own, beſides from this it followeth by the Students confeſſion, that women may as lawfully ſpeak in the Church, as the licentiat Students, whom the Presbytery permits to ſpeak in the Church, before they are ordained, they paſſe our chief objection very overly, drawne from 1 Cor. 11. 5. where the Apoſtle gives direct rules how women should behave themſelves in their publick praying and preaching, alledging *there are rules given in Scripture concerning things, that were never lawfull, but only permitted, &c.* as of polygamie under the law, but they should have remembred that theſe are rules given by the Apoſtle, to the Chriſtian Church of Corinth, and ſeing the Students ſuppoſe that *the Apoſtle gave directions to the Church of Corinth not only of things that belong not to them now, but which are not lawfull for them* (a doctrine we queſtion if their Maſters will approve of, or of the conſequence of which themſelves are aware) it remains for them to prove that theſe two rules forbidding womens ſpeaking belongs to us, or is not of the number of theſe uſeleſſe rules, more then that other concerning the manner of their preaching. So we hope this ſolution is impugned, and deſire they may be ſure not to forget to bring us this reaſon, when they write next.

SECTION FOURTH.

Concerning the neceſſity of immediat Revelations to the building up of true faith, containing an anſwer to the Students ſecond Section from pag. 78. to pag. 92.

IN their ſtating the controverſy, they ſay, *theſe inward revelations are not ſubjective revelations, or divine illuminations.* This is falſe, for as we have above shewed, one and the ſame illumination, that is effective or ſubjective is alſo objective, and the objective is effective. Again they ſay, *the queſtion is not, if immediat objective revelations be poſſible, or be ſometimes made to ſome* de facto. This conceſſion will over-

throw much of all their own work, for if they admitt that any perſon in our time hath immediate objective revelations, admitt Peter or John, their former argument will as much militate againſt this reall immediat objective revelation granted by them, as againſt thoſe, which they do not grant, ſeing pag. 7. at the letter *A*, they ſay, *ſuppoſe that the ſpirit reveall the objects of faith immediatly none will deny, that he is a rule*, (or rather ruler) *to them who have him ſo.* A good conceſſion, but which quite undoes their own cauſe, for now let us apply their former argument againſt this reall objective revelation granted by them, as thus, we ought not to believe *that as the rule of faith, of which there can be no evidence given, but there can be no evidence in the world given of the Spirit that is in Peter and John, therefore*, &c. Again, if Peter & John ſay, they can give an evidence of the Spirit of God in them, to wit, their own declaration in life and power, as alſo the immediat teſtimony of the Spirit, or the Scriptures teſtimony, let us apply in the laſt place their argument uſed againſt us, and ſee if it will not be as good againſt Peter and John, whom they grant *de facto* (according to their hypotheſis) to have immediat objective revelation. The argument is this, *that which as really agrees to Enthuſiaſt Heretieks, as to them, can be no evidence, but that evidence*, to wit, *their own declaration, and ſaying, that both they and their adverſaries have the immediat teſtimony of the Spirit witneſsing to the truth of it, would as really agree to Enthuſiaſt Heretieks, therefore*, &c. Yea not only might they thus argue againſt any mens haveing immediat objective revelation in our dayes, but againſt the Prophets and Apoſtles having it, ſeing the argument might every way be as ſtrong, againſt their having it, as againſt our having it, eſpecially at ſuch times, as they wrought no outward miracles in the ſight of the people, to whom they were ſent, as oft they did not. When the Lord ſent Jonas to preach to the Ninivites, he wrought no miracle in their ſight. Now let us put the Students in the Ninivites place, and we ſhall find they could argue as ſtoutly and hardily againſt Jonas, as now they can do againſt any Quaker, they could tell him, *he could give no evidence of the Spirit of God in him, giving any ſuch meſſage, as for his declaration, it would not ſuffice, becauſe his ſaying he had the Spirit would be as good a ground for any other Enthuſiaſt Heretick.* But further theſe ſtout and hardy warriours could have uſed theſe ſame arguments againſt the Prophets, when they wrought miracles, for they could have alledged the miracles were not true miracles, but falſe, and ſuch as may

be

be done by the power of the devil, and ſo if any could produce miracles now, (as there have been) they would no more be believed, then the unbelieving Jewes believed the miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. For they ſtill looked upon them to be deceivers. It is clear from Scripture that Antichriſt ſhall be permitted to work falſe miracles, but that they ſhall ſo counterfeit the true, that it will be hard to diſcerne, the one from the other, without Gods immediat direction and teaching. And therefore the preaching of ſound doctrine, accompanied with a holy life, is a better evidence of a true Prophet, then all outward miracles whatſoever, as Chriſt ſaid, *by their fruits ye ſhall know them*; he doth not ſay, *by their miracles*, but *by their fruits*. Now we are moſt willing to be tryed by this rule, if both our doctrine, and life and manner of converſation, be not anſwerable to that of the Prophets, Chriſt and the Apoſtles, then let them ſay, we have not that ſpirit, which was in them. But if they can not make out this, they but fight as men beating the aire.

Pag. 80. They argue, *that there is no ſubſtantiall living principle in man, that is the good ſeed, becauſe then the evill ſeed or principle ſhould alſo be ſubſtantiall. But this is abſurd, therefore.* That this is abſurd, they argue, *for then it ſhould be created, by God, and ſo God ſhould be the author of evill and ſin, or it ſhould be uncreated, and conſequently God.* To this we anſwer. The ſame argument militats as much and rather more againſt their own principle, for ſeing they hold ſin, to be *ſomewhat*, (whether a ſubſtance, or an accident, is all one as to the argument) we argue by a retortion againſt themſelves, *either it is created, or uncreated*, and ſo the ſame inconvenience would follow. But to anſwer directly, we ſay, ſin conſidered in its formall reaſon, is rather a privation, then any reall being, as blindneſs or lameneſs in a mans body, or corruption in wine, or any other liquor. But if they enquire about the ſubject of this privation, *whether it be a ſubſtance*. We anſwer, it is, and it is clear from the Scriptures teſtimony, that as Chriſt rules in the Saints, ſo the devil rules in the wicked, and is in them, and as God hath his ſeed and birth in the Saints, ſo the devil hath his ſeed and birth in the wicked, which is of the devils nature. But if it be asked further, whether it is a ſubſtance, we anſwer firſt, with inquiring at them another queſtion, and retorting the argument upon them, whether the devil is a ſubſtance, *yea or nay*? If yea, either he is created, or uncreated, if *created, then God is the author of the devil*; if un-

created, then he should be God, their own conſequence, which is blaſphemy. But 2. the true anſwer to both is that he who, is, now the devil was created of God a good Angel, but by his own voluntary fall, he hath reduced himſelf to be a devil not by any reall creation, but by a degeneration, and as is the devil himſelf ſo is his ſeed, a corrupted, degenerated principle from what it was originally before ſin was, but if we take the ſeed of the devil diſtinctly, as diſtinct from himſelf, we do not ſay, it is any percipient principle, that ſeeth or knoweth, &c. for it is rather of the nature of a body, then of a percipient, intelligent ſpirit, and the Scripture calleth it a body, to wit, *the body of death*. But whether the ſeed of ſin be a ſubſtance, or not, the Students argument is altogether impertinent to argue that becauſe the good ſeed is a ſubſtantiall living principle, &c. then the evill principle or ſeed ſhould alſo be ſubſtantiall, living, &c. for the ſame reaſons. We deny this Conſequence, for there are greater reaſons whereby to prove the one then the other. If they think to argue from the rule of contraries, they think foolishly, for it would as much follow, that becauſe a man is a ſubſtance, who ſeeth and heareth, &c. that therefore a mans blindneſs, and deafneſs, and lameneſs are alſo ſubſtances, and that blindneſſe ſeeth, deafneſſe heareth, lameneſſe walketh. Do they not know, the maxim in Logick that telleth them, *ſubſtantia ſubſtantiæ propriè non contrariatur*. i. e. one ſubſtance properly is not contrary to another. But laſt of all we may more juſtly retort this blaſphemous conſequence upon many of their own church, who hold, *that God ſtirreth up the devil and all wicked men unto all their wicked actions, by an irreſiſtible motion or quality which he infuſeth into them, commonly called, prædeterminatio phyſica*. Is not this to make God the author of ſin? As alſo many of them teach that Originall ſin is a poſitive quality, infuſed into the ſouls of men at their creation. Concerning which poſitive quality, we thus argue, *either it is created or uncreated*, &c. and ſo the inconveniences of their argument will fall much more upon their own heads, for they cannot alledge that this poſitive quality at its firſt creation was firſt good, and afterwards became changed into evill, becauſe no quality can admit any ſuch tranſmutation, as for example, whitneſſe can never become blackneſſe, nor ſweetneſſe bitterneſſe, nor ſtreightneſſe crookedneſſe, although a ſubſtance that is white, may looſe its whitneſſe, and may become black, and that which is ſweet may become bitter, and that which is ſtreight become crooked.

In the proſecution of their ſecond argument, they bring their matter

to

to this issue, that G. K. *holds the seed it self to be contradistinct from the manifestation, becaus the manifestation is in the seed*, but we deny the consequence, doe not they say, that the manifestation of Gods will is in the Scripture, and also that the Scripture it self is the manifestation of Gods will? That G. K. calleth the seed both a substance, and a manifestation, is as reasonable as to say, there are outward manifestations of Gods goodnesse, power, and wisdome in the heavens, and earth; and yet the heavens and earth are the very outward manifestations themselves. Are not our meat and drink and cloathing, naturall and outward manifestations of the goodnesse of God to us, and are not these things substances, and doth not God manifest his goodnesse also in them? What blind reasons are these, which those poore blind men bring forth against the truth? Again they argue, *that this manifestation* (which wee say is a substance) *depends not* â solo Deo, *cannot exist without a subject, nay not without the understanding, to which it is made.* All which they barely assert, but do not offer to prove. Again they say, it is but a meer action, and *applicatio agentis ad passum.* But how do they prove it? here they are as dumb as stones. Perhaps they think to prove it, because *manifestation*, is a *nomen verbale*, which commonly being derived from the active verb signifieth an action, but this is meerly to play in words, and not to dispute, for they may as well say, because the whole world is called the creation, (for *Creation* is an active verbale) therefore the whole world is a meer action, or *applicatio agentis ad passum.* We deny not, but the action, or motion, which proceeds from the Spirit of God, may also be called a manifestation. But we say, the seed it self, is also a manifestation; and those inward heavenly refreshments which God ministers unto the souls of his Saints, are as reall substantiall spirituall manifestations of his goodnesse, as the outward earthly refreshments, *to wit* meat and drink, are reall substantiall naturall manifestations. Lastly, they query, *if the manifestation be a substance, whether is it one manifestation, or all the manifestations?* To this we answer, they that please to call the action, or motion, (which proceeds from the Spirit of God, an an efficient cause) a manifestation, may easily distingnish manifestation, as it is a principle, or *quid permanens*, or as it is an action, or *quid transiens*, now to apply, we say, the substantiall manifestations of God, inwardly to our souls are many, as they are *quid permanens*, and *per modum principii*, for as God nourisheth our outward man, not with bread and drink once only, but often,

and

and many are our outward refreshments, all which are ſubſtances, agreeing in this that they are manifeſtations and pledges of Gods bounty unto us, ſo doth he nourish our inward man, with ſpirituall bread and drink not once only, but often, giving us daily the *ſuperſubſtantiall bread*, as the words in the prayer may be tranſlated, and have been by ſome learned men, and thus we have anſwered their laſt argument, in their §. 5. without recurring to any *idea Platonica*, a term they vainly bring in to their argument, to move people to laugh at their folly. And thus we hope it is apparent, that we have no need to retract our anſwers given in the diſpute, as they vainly imagin.

It would be more labour and expence of time and paper, then the thing is worth, to anſwer them in all their pittifull ridiculous reaſonings in theſe matters, in every particular. Therefore not to weary the Reader, nor miſpend time, we ſhall ſet down ſome few clear diſtinct propoſitions, which ſhall clearly anſwer any ſeeming difficulties alledged by them in this whole Section, as in relation to Chriſt.

1. *Propoſition.* The Word, or Son of God, hath the whole intire nature of Man, Spirit, Soul and Body united to him in the Heavens, and he is the ſame in ſubſtance, what he was upon earth, both in Spirit, ſoul, and body.

2. Chriſt in us, or the ſeed, is not a third ſpirituall nature, diſtinct from that which was in the man Chriſt Jeſus, that was crucified according to the flesh at Jeruſalem, for the ſame that is in us, was and is in him, and as it is in him, its the fulneſſe or ſpring of the ſame in us, as the ſtreame, nor is there any difference, but ſuch as is betwixt the ſpring and the ſtreame, which are one in their nature and ſubſtance.

3. We ſay that the ſame ſeed, and life, is in us, which was in him, and is in him, in the fulneſſe, as water is in the ſpring, and in us as the ſtreame, and this ſeed and ſpirituall nature which is both in him, and us doth belong to him, as he is the ſecond Adam, or man Chriſt, therefore this ſeed being in us, the Man Chriſt is in us; not according to his whole manhood, but according unto that which is proper unto it, and yet without all diviſion, as the naturall life is in all the members, but more principally in the head, and heart, without any diviſion, ſo this ſpirituall life and nature is both in Chriſt our head, and in us, by which he dwelleth in us, as the ſpirit of man doth in the body; and we eat and partake of his flesh.

4. But

4. But if they argue that at leaſt Chriſt hath three natures in himſelf, we ſay, Their own principle will conclude that as much as ours, for the Godhead is one nature, the nature of the ſoul, is a ſecond, and the nature of the body is the third, and our adverſaries themſelves teach that as God is three perſons in one nature, ſo Chriſt is three natures in one perſon.

5. Although the word or λογος ſhould aſſume into union with it ſelfe not only two natures, but three, it ſhould not make either two, or three Chiſts, but one, for they grant that the Word hath aſſumed two, to wit, the ſoul and body of the man Chriſt, and yet he is not two Chriſts, but one, even as the king is but one king, although he poſſeſſe three kingdomes, for *ad multiplicationem obliquorum non multiplicantur concreta*, as your Logick teacheth.

6. The ſeed and ſpirituall body of Chriſt both in him, and in us belonging to Chriſt, as he is the ſecond Adam, is as really and immediatly united unto the word, as his outward body was, for the wholl manhood of Chriſt was united to the Logos, and the Logos to it, and in it, therefore the ſufferings of this ſeed and ſpirituall body of Chriſt in us, are as really his ſufferings, as theſe He accomplished at Jeruſalem.

7. This ſeed is not our ſoules, but is a *medium* betwixt God and us, and our union with God is but mediat through this, whereas the union of God with this is immediat, Therefor none of us are either Chriſt, or God, but God and Chriſt are in us.

8. Seing this ſeed and ſpiriuall nature of Chriſt is one, and the ſame, both in him, and in us, it is moſt unreaſonable to argue, that there are as many Chriſts as men, as it is unreaſonable to argue, that becaus the ſoul of man is in all his members, that *therefore*, *as many members as many ſouls*. The element of the aire is but one only element, although it fill the wholl univerſe, betwixt the ſtars and the earth. And the element of water, is but one, although it fill many channells.

9. Chriſt outwardly died but once, but inwardly he dieth in a ſpirituall and myſticall ſenſe, as often as any crucifie him to themſelves by their unfaithfulneſſe, and diſobedience, as the Scriptures declare.

10. As for the ſatisfaction of Chriſt without us, we own it againſt the Socinians, and that it was full and compleat in its kind, yet not ſo, as to exclude the reall worth of the work and ſufferings of Chriſt in us, nor his preſent interceſſion: for if Chriſt his interceſſion without us in heaven,

doth not derogate from his ſatisfaction, but doth fulfill it, no more doth his interceſſion and ſufferings in us.

11. The ſufferings of Chriſt in men are voluntary, and yet without ſin, as his ſufferings at Jeruſalem were voluntary and without ſin, for as he joined not with them, who outwardly crucified him, in any Active way to coucurre with them or countenance them, ſo nor doth he inwardly joine with men to countenance or concurre with them, when they crucifie him, by their ſins.

12. As there was no need that the Jewes ſhould have crucified Chriſt outwardly, ſo as purpoſely to ſin, that Chriſt might ſuffer for ſin outwardly, (although the prophecies of Chriſts ſufferings and Gods foreknowledge was certaine) ſo ther is no need that men ſhould now ſin to crucifie Chriſt inwardly, for if there be any difficulty in the one, it recurres in the other much more. Now, either men ſin, or ſin not, If they ſin, Chriſt ſuffers by it; If they ſin not, he doth not ſuffer, (nor is it needfull that he ſuffer when men ſin not) but all men have ſinned, and Chriſt hath ſuffered for, and by the ſins of all, both without and within.

13. Chriſt's outward ſufferings at Jeruſalem were neceſſary unto mens ſalvation, notwithſtanding his inward ſufferings, that he might be a compleat Saviour in all reſpects; for it behoved Chriſt not only to ſuffer in the members of his body, but alſo in the head, ſo that it is a moſt foolish and unreaſonable conſequence to argue, that becaus Chriſt ſuffereth in the members, therefore he needed not to ſuffer in the head: wheras the ſufferings of Chriſt in the members are but a ſmall part of what he ſuffered in the head, by being *offered up once for all*, yet a part they are, as ſerving to make up the integrall of his ſufferings.

14. The doctrines of the incarnation, ſufferings, death, and reſurrection of Chriſt &c: are neceſſary every where to be preached, and being preached, to be believed and improved, as being of and belonging unto the integrall parts of Chriſtianity and Chriſtian religion; even as the armes and leggs are integrall parts of a man, without which, though it is poſſible that a man may be and live, yet he is not a compleat man as to all his parts, even ſo, though one may be a Chriſtian, and partaker in part of Chriſtianity, and in that ſtate be accepted of God, as is clear in the caſe of Cornelius, without the expreſſe knowledge of the outward birth, ſufferings: &c: of Chriſt, yet without the ſame he is not a compleat Chriſtian, as wanting the knowledge of that which ſerveth to the perfection & accompliſhment therof.

Be-

Before we cloſe this particular, we can not omitt to take notice of two moſt horrible perverſions, committed by the Students ſect. 2. The one is pag. 83. where they alledge out of G. K. his book of *Immed. Revel.* pag. 7. *that G. K. holds that when Chriſt ſuffers by mans ſin, that he joines with man*, which is a moſt abominable lye and perverſion. The ſecond perverſion of the Students. which is no leſſe abominable, is in pag. 79. of their book, where to cover their other perverſion, they cite moſt falſely and perfidiouſly a place in G.K. book, where they bring him in, ſaying, [*though it may be hurt and ſlain, by joining with the contrary ſeed, before it come to its perfect formation*] and thus they would prove that according to G. K. Chriſt joines with man, when man ſinneth Now we beſeech the Reader to look to pag. 7. in G. K. his book of *Im: Revela.* and he will find that the words of G. K. are thus, [*Though till it come to its perfect formation it can ſuffer hurt ſo farre as to be ſlain through man his joining unto the contrary ſeed and birth*] Mark Reader G. K. ſaith *through man his joining*, but the Stuents, purpoſely to deceive the Reader, have left out the word *man*, that the Reader may underſtand it of *Chriſt* his joining; a thing never entered into G. K. his heart to think, farre leſſe to write. This abominable perverſion of the Students is enough to make all ſober men abhorre them, as wilfull and impudent lyars, for ſuch a manifeſt and viſible thing could not be done in ignorance. But are not theſe Students rare diſputants, who thus argue againſt the Q. pag. 83. l. 5, 6. *Either he* (to wit Chriſt) *ſuffereth within willingly, and ſo he ſins, it being by the ſins of man that he ſuffers and is crucified within.* For by this argument it will follow not only that all the Martyrs when they ſuffered willingly, did ſin, but alſo that Chriſt himſelf when he ſuffered willingly by the ſins and wicked hands of the Jewes that crucified him outwardly, did ſin, which is the higheſt blaſphemy, and naturally followes by the Students argument. But it ſeems these Students have no mind to ſuffer willingly for righteouſneſſe ſake, ſeing they are men of ſuch principles, that think, when any doth ſuffer willingly, he ſins. We leave the Reader to judge whether ſuch ſtuffe and worke of the Students be *Quakeriſm canvaſſed, and a confutation of the Q. errours*, or rather whether it be not *a manifeſt betraying of the Truth, and declaring themſelves guilty of higheſt blaſphemy, lying and confuſion*; and whether theſe men who are guilty of ſuch confuſion themſelves, are fitt to accuſe others as not writing perſpicuouſly and clearly, as they doe G. K. for his book of *Imm: Revela.* pag. laſt of their preface.

But G. K. doubteth not but that his book will be acknowledged to be clear and perſpicuous, where it meets with men of a clear underſtaning, ſuch as the Students (to be ſure) are not.

As for thoſe ſtories about J. N. they have been long agoe anſwered by our friends, who judged both him, and them that joined with him in that particular, as hee alſo judged and condemned himſelf, and was by the mercy of God reduced to a ſober mind. As for that paſſage in Chriſtopher Atkinſons book, wee can ſay nothing to it, unleſſe wee ſaw the book which is in G. M. his cuſtody (which showes that the Students have plowed with his heifer) who refuſed to let us have the uſe of it, to ſee whether the place was perverted, and wee did not know where to have it any where elſe, but it is incumbent on them to prove whether C. A. or his book was owned really by the Q. for wee can prove hee was denyed by them, and if he denyed that Chriſt is man, wee deny him and his book both; for wee truely believe that Chriſt is both God and man.

In the proſecution of their ſecond argument, Sect. 2. They take great paines to prove *that heathens have the Law and book of Nature*, and *from exerciſeing their reaſon and underſtanding naturally they may know many things*, which wee doe not deny, and ſo they might have ſpared that labour. But wheras they alledge that there is nothing needfull to be known and believed by the heathens, but what the book of nature and their naturall underſtanding, and reaſon as men, can teach them, according to the Q. principle, and conſequently the heathens need not theſe ſupernaturall revelations. This they affirme without any proofe. Wee shall give manifeſt Inſtances to the contrary, For the Q. ſay, All men need both to have and to know a *ſupernaturall influence and work of the Spirit of God in order to their ſalvation*. And this alſo our adverſaries grant. Now the Heathens need a divine revelation to make this knowne to them. For the book of Nature or the meer natures of things being conſidered can not teach men what is ſupernaturall, and ſo it can not teach men that in all their actings they are to have a ſupernaturall end, nor can it teach them, that they are to love, feare, ſerve and worship God, from a ſupernaturall principle of Gods grace, which are the greateſt duties required of man, and if it can not teach men, and convince them of their greateſt duties, it followeth, that it can not convince them of the great ſins, that are contrarie unto thoſe duties. Alſo Nature can not teach men the myſtery of regeneration, (which yet is needfull to be knowne)

for

for men who are but too much addicted to naturall reaſon, and ſearchings into the book of nature (but deſpiſe the divine and ſupernaturall illumination of Chriſt in them) think regeneration a fiction, or unneceſſary thing. Other inſtances could be given, but leaſt they ſhould call them the Q. errours, we ſhall forbear, contenting our ſelves with ſuch as our adverſaries acknowledge to be true. But 2. if it were granted that the book of Nature could in ſome ſort diſcover all things neceſſary to ſalvation (without ſupernaturall light) which yet we deny, it doth not follow, *that therfore divine, ſupernaturall objective revelation, is not neceſſary*, becaus the diſcovery that the book of nature and naturall reaſon gives to men of divine things, as of the *power, wisdom, juſtice, goodneſſe, love and mercy of God*, is but *dimm, weak, faint and barren*, and is no more a proportionat object to the ſpirituall ſenſations of the ſoul, then a report of meat and drink and cloathing are a ſutable or proportionat object to the taſt, and feeling of the outward man; the ſouls of men need not only to be convinced that ther is a God, who is good, loving, mercifull, powerfull and juſt, but they need alſo in order to their ſalvation to have a feeling of his divine power, to ſee and taſt that he is good, to handle that word of life, to know Chriſt in themſelves, to have the love of God shed abroad in them, by the holy Spirit, which love is a ſenſible and perceptible object, and ſo is objective. For if the Scriptures be nota ſufficient objective revelation of God, and the things of his kingdom, much leſſe the book of nature, &c but the firſt is true, therefore the ſecond is true alſo. Now that the Scriptures are not a ſufficient objective revelation of God, &c. G K. hath proved at large in his book of *Immed. Revela.* and we need not produce any new arguments here, untill the Students, or their maſters refute thoſe already ſet downe in that book, only this we ſay in short, Nature and Scripture tell us that ther is a God, but they can neither give us a ſenſe, ſight, or taſting of him, or of his love, or of his Spirituall judgments, as theſe things are inwardly experienced, where God reveals them, Nature can not refresh, or comfort the ſoul, nor pour in wine and oil into it, when it is wounded with ſin, and although it could tell that God can doe this, what comfort could that be to the ſoul, unleſſe God himſelfe doe it, and make the ſoul ſenſibile of his hand reaching unto it, the Spirituall things themſelves that nature can not afford. Alſo nature cannot discover the Spirituall judgments of God in the ſoul, wherby he cleanſeth it from ſin, as by water and fire. Now as to the ſe-

cond branch of their argument, that the Scriptures are a ſufficient objective revelation of all things neceſſary to ſalvation, this we altogether deny, as is ſaid, for although the ſcripture is a full enough declaration of all doctrines and principles both eſſentiall and integrall of Chriſtian religion, yet the Scripture doth propoſe divine things and objects, but as a Card or Mappe doth a land and the fruits of it, to the outward eye. Now as this is not a ſufficient objective propoſall, becauſe we need to ſee the Land it ſelfe, and to taſt, and eat and drink of the fruit of it, ſo our ſouls need a more near and immediat diſcovery of God, then the Scripture, which is but a report of him, that he may feed and nourish us by his divine manifeſtations; and here in the proſecution of this argument, they are at great paines to prove, *that the Scriptures are given from God*, which we deny not, although ſome of their proofes be weak, but whatever reaſons can be brought to prove that the Scriptures are given from God, if the inward teſtimony of the Spirit of God, be not believed, and received, theſe reaſons cannot beget any divine, ſaving faith, (wherof only wee ſpeak) but a meer humane and naturall faith or conviction.

As to that place of Scripture 2 Cor. 4:3, 4 *if our goſpell &c*: that is, ſay they, *the outward goſpell*, but doth Paul ſay ſo? Nay; Look the Greek text, and you will find the contrary, that the Goſpell he ſpake of, was *hidd in them that are loſt*, ſo the Greek. Therefore it was inward, and this Sctipture they bring to prove, that the Scriprures have objective evidence and perſpicuity in themſelves, whereas Paul doth not ſay of the *Scripture*, but of the *Goſpell, which is the power of God.* And whereas they query *If a perſon may have immediat objective revelations, who hath not his mind wel diſpoſed, and if ſo, what advantage would he have by them, which he might not have without them by the Scriptures?* We anſwer, much every way, becaus the Scripture is not able to diſpoſe his mind, as our adverſaries grant, but theſe immediate objective revelations are alſo really effective, and have ſufficient power and ability in them, to diſpoſe his mind, if he do not reſiſt them. Again, wheras they query, *May a perſon be wel diſpoſed who hath not ſuch revelations?* We anſwer; No: yet he may want ſome, and have other ſome, but if he may, yet there is need of ſuch revelations, even as if a mans eye, or taſt, were never ſo wel diſpoſed, he needeth the objects themſelves; and as painted bread, or a diſcourſe of bread can not ſatisfie the naturall taſt and appetite, no more can the Scripture words ſatisfie the taſt and appetite of the ſoul. They cite

2 Tim.

2 Tim. 3:15, 16, 17. to prove *that the Scriptures of Old and New Teſtament are the principall, compleat; and infallible rule of faith and manners*; but this place doth not ſay, that they are ſo, the Scripture we grant, but deny their conſequence, which is merly begged without a proofe. They confeſſe pag. 90. *that the Scriptures are not ſufficient every way, ſo as to exclude the inward efficiency of the Spirit, and the concurrence of other cauſes.* Very wel: Enough to overthrow their whole argument for among other cauſes, *divine inſpiration is a maine*, for indeed the inward efficiency of the Spirit, is that objective revelation which we plead for, only they deny it to be objective, wheras we ſay, it is both effective and objective, as if a man ſhould grant that the light and heat of the fire doth both enlighten us, and warme us but deny that either that light or heat of the fire is objective, to our diſcerning, or perceptible by themſelves, which were ridiculous, and as ridiculous is their conceit of an influence of the Spirit that is meerly *effective, and not objective. That the books of the old and new teſtament are called the Scripture, by way of eminency*, we deny not, (although the name is given at times to other writings) nor doth this refute G. K. his tranſlation of that Scripture 2 Tim. 3:16. which is confirmed by the Syriack, which hath it thus, *In Scripturâ enim quæ per Spiritum ſcripta eſt, utilitas eſt ad doctrinam &c.* i.e. *For in the Scripture which is written by the Spirit, there is profite.* But their reaſon from the Conjunction [*and*] is both foolish and blaſphemous, for if the words be rendered thus, *All Scripture given by inſpiration is and profitable*, is no more non-ſenſe then divers other places in the Scripture, where the Conjuction *and* ſeemeth to be redundant, as in that place Joh. 8:25. where the Greek hath it thus τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν i.e. *The beginning* (or from the beginning) *the ſame which and I ſpeak unto you.* Now if the Conjunction [*and*] render not this place non-ſenſe, no more doth it render that in Timothy; but the Students ignorance renders them rather blaſphemers, and their arguments blaſphemous againſt the words of Chriſt. Moreover the conjunction καὶ may ſignifie a ſtrong affirmation, (as to ſay, *even, truely, indeed,*) as both our English tranſlation hath it, Joh. 8:25. and Schrevelius in his Greek Lexicon doth render it: and thus the words have good ſenſe, *All Scripture* (or writing) *given by inſpiration, is even* (*or indeed*) *profitable.* And whereas, they ſay, none but a Q. or Jeſuit would ſo interpret the place, they declare their malice and ignorance, for William Tindall that famous Proteſtant martyr in his tranſlation of

the

the Bible, for which the Papiſts burnt him, did tranſlate it, as G. K. doth whom we think the Students dare not accuſe as a Jeſuit, that he was a Q. in ſo farr as he held divers of our principles, condemned by the Students, we ſhall not deny. As for us we bleſſe the Lord our faith ſtands not on ſuch a ſmall nicity, as the want of an [*is*] or the redundahcy of an [*and*] let them look to that, whoſe faith knoweth no other foundation, but the letter. It doth nothing hurt our faith nor leſſen the due eſteeme of the Scripture to us, if peradventure an [*is*] hath been loſt, or an [*and*] hath crept into the text ſince the originall coppies were loſt. This we know and can prove that the Scripture can not profit any man to ſalvation without the illumination or inſpiration of the Spirit, which is both *effective* and *objective*, and which our adverſaries grant at leaſt to be *effective*. And if they make one exception why may not wee make another; or if they ſay, the Spirit is neceſſary one way, why may not we ſay, it is neceſſare another way? But then *the Scriptures*, ſay they, *would not be profitable at all in any manner or kind*, we deny the conſequence, for it is profitable, yea and neceſſary *in genere objecti materialis*, i. e. *as the materiall object* in relation to all hiſtoricall truths, and divers other dogmatical and doctrinall points, which perhaps we would not have knowne without the Scripture, although we had had the Spirit in as large a meaſure as men now have it. Again, the Scripture is profitable *in genere objecti remoti & ſecundarii*. i. e. by way *of a remote and ſecondary object and rule*, even as in relation to teſtimonies of life and experience, which may be knowne without the Scripture, yet the Scripture is a ſecondary confirmation and help even in that caſe as a card or map of a land is unto a traveller, that travells through the land it ſelfe, and ſeeth the high wayes, who will not throw away his card, becauſe he ſees the land it ſelfe, but will both delight and profit himſelf to compare them both together. Other great and weighty uſes wee could give, but theſe ſuffice to ſerve as inſtances againſt their weak and ſorry argumentation.

Their laſt argument is from Joh. 12:48. *The word that I have ſpoken, the ſame ſhall judge him in the laſt day*; But how prove they that this is the letter of the Scripture, much of which was not then writ? And although this *Word* were not *Chriſt* himſelf, yet it may be an inward teſtimony ſpoken by Chriſt in mens hearts. Here they meerly begg and prove not. But 2. ſuppoſe it were the Scripture or written Law, as that cited by them Rom. 2:12. it will only follow, that the Scripture is a ſecondary Law or rule,

rule, which we willingly grant, and that by it men who have the Scriptures shall be judged, but not by them only, for *if the Gentiles who have not the written Law, shall be judged by the Law in the conscience*, so shall these also who have both inward and outward be judged by both, and consequently their damnation shall be greater.

SECTION FIFTH.

Of worship being an Answer unto their third Section concerning inspirations to duty.

IN their stating the controversie in this particular, they grossly prevaricate in divers things, as where they say, N. 2. *the question is not only about duty on the matter*, videlicet *the act of prayers* &c. *as separated from the right manner*, viz. *sincerity and truth*, wheras indeed the question betwixt them and us, is about prayer, as separated from the right manner, *viz.* sincerity and truth. For they say, God requires men to pray, without any inspiration, or gracious influence of the spirit, so that such a prayer is an answering of the obligation to the duty upon the matter, although it be separated from the right manner, and accordingly they doe both require and allow men to pray, when they have no gracious influence, or motion therunto, telling them, *that even such prayers are required, and that they doe better to give such prayers, as want sincerity unto God, then not to pray at all, seing such lifelesse and spiritlesse prayers have the matter of true prayer, although they want the right manner.* Wheras we on the contrary affirm that lifelesse prayers have neither the *right matter* and substance, nor yet the *right manner* of prayer, and therfor are not at all required in Scripture. Yet we deny not but many times, when men want an influence of life to pray, they are still under the obligation, and at such times it is their sin not to pray, because they ought to have suitable influences to prayer, which would not be wanting if they were faithfull unto God, but when through unfaithfulnesse they want them, it doth not excuse them from being under the obligation, yet still when they want the helpe of the Spirit, they ought to pray by the Spirit, becaus they ought to have it. Even as when

one man oweth unto another man a juſt debt, in money, the debter ought to pay the money, although he have no money to pay it with, for his want of the money doth not excuſe him from the obligation to pay it; yet he ought to pay the debt only with money, or the equivalent of it, but if he should offer to pay it, with any thing, that is not money, nor moneys worth; as ſuppoſe with a few counters, this is no anſwering the obligation, either in the *right matter*, *or manner*, and ſo it is in the caſe in hand. Again, N. 8. They fall into the like prevarication, in alledging *the queſtion is not about a new heart, and ſpirituall principle of obedience, for they owne that as indiſpenſably neceſſary for acceptable performance.* But do not they ſay, that when men pray, without a new heart, they do in part anſwer the obligation? and do not they encourage them to pray, even the moſt wicked? This is denyed by the people called Quakers, and is a great part of the queſtion. We ſay indeed wicked men ought to pray, but not remaining wicked, but that they ought to forſake their wickedneſſe, and have a new heart, and therewith to pray. Moreover, whereas they ſay, *the queſtion is not about every performance, but about acceptable performance*: Herein they moſt palpably contradict themſelves N. 9. where they grant, that no act of worship can be acceptably performed withot theſe influences, and they wel know that the Qu: ſay the ſame, the queſtion then is not about acceptable performance ſeing both they and we grant, that no duty can be acceptably performed without the Spirit, ſo that if the Students had underſtood their matter, they would have ſaid, *the queſtion is not about acceptable performance, but about ſimple performance, whether there be any obligation to performe duty, that is not acceptable*, which they affirme and we deny: for indeed unacceptable performance is as good as no performance, but rather worſe, as if under the Law, the Jewes had offered up *a dogs neck* in place of a ſacrifice, it had been a greater ſin, then not to offer at all. As it is a greater offence for a man to offer to pay his debt with counters or pennies made of ſlait-ſtone, then not to pay at all. Another groſſe errour they committ, in alledging *the queſtion is about præparatory motions, prævious in time*, this is a lye, we challenge them to ſhew us any ſuch thing in our books, we doe not require motions or influences of the Spirit, previous in time, (although they are oft given) it ſufficeth that they are previous in order of nature; as the cauſe is previous unto the effect, which is not alwayes in time, but in nature; but the queſtion is indeed,

deed, about the neceſſity of motions, to, and in the performance of duty ſo as the performance is to be *in*, *by*, *through*, and *with the Spirit*, which may wel be without a prævioufueſſe in time, as to inward duty, at leaſt, and if the outward can be ſimultaneous with the inward, it may alſo be as to the outward, but if it can not be ſo ſoone as the inward in ſome caſes, the reaſon is not for want of the motion, but becauſe the bodily organs can not ſo haſtily anſwer the motion, as the mind it ſelfe can, and it ſufficiently anſwereth the motion, that the mind anſwer it firſt, and then the bodily organs as ſoone as their nature can permitt. There is yet another great errour they committ in alledging, *ſuch a lively and ſpirituall diſpoſition as being neceſſary in our ſenſe*, whereas we doe not lay it upon ſuch a lively &c: as if we required ſuch a degree of life, for the leaſt meaſure of life that is but able to carry forth the ſoul in any living meaſure of performance, is ſufficient, where the ſoul keepeth to the meaſure, and doth not exceed, or goe beyond it.

In the proſecution of their arguments, they are no leſſe unhappy in the ſtating of the queſtion; as will ſhortly appeare. Pag. 95. 67. they bring in R B. and A. Sk. *denying their ſequel*, which they laboure to prove, (but how unſucceſsfully, we ſhall ſee anon) becaus as angels and bruts agree in that they are both ſubſtances, ſo ſpirituall duties, and other duties agree in that they are both to be performed in the Spirit. But what then? Yet the difference is ſtill great betwixt thoſe duties that as to their matter are naturall and civill, and thoſe which as to their very matter are ſpirituall, as for example to eat, to plough, to pay a debt, are not ſpirituall as to their matter, but only as to their manner, and end, when acceptably performed, and therefore the matter of thoſe duties, and whole ſubſtance of them may be, without any gracious motion of the Spirit, and in that caſe the performances themſelves are really profitable in the creation among men, and conſequently doe anſwer the obligation in part, but prayer, and thankſgiving &c: are duties wholly ſpirituall, both as to matter, or ſubſtance, and as to manner and end, ſo that whoſo eſſayeth to doe any of them without the gracious motions of the Spirit, he leaveth not only the *right manner*, but the very *matter* and *ſubſtance* of the *duty* behind him, and bringeth the meer accidents along with him, which have no profit nor uſe to men, nor are any wiſe in the leaſt part an anſwer of the obligation: and as to that Scripture cited by them, *the plowing of the wicked is ſin*, Prov. 21:4. they do not prove,

that it is meant of outward plowing, the margin of our English hath it, *the light of the wicked*, and *Arius Montanus* rendreth it on the margine, *cogitatio*, the *thought*, that the plowing of the wicked is ſin in reſpect of the manner, and laſt end, we grant, but that the action materially conſidered is ſin, we altogether deny, even in a wicked man, for the outward mechanick and bodily act is good in its nature, and profitable, as alſo in ſo farr as it may be for the maintainance of his family, it is good, ſo that in reſpect of the matter, and ſubordinate end, there is no difference betwixt the plowing of a good man, and a wicked, whereas the prayer of a good man by the Spirit, and the prayer of a wicked man, without the Spirit, differ materially, in their very nature and ſubſtance, the good mans prayer by the Spirit is true and reall prayer, but the wicked mans prayer, is no true prayer at all, but a dead image of it, nor is the wicked man a true worſhipper, for he only is a true worshipper according unto the expreſſe doctrine of Chriſt, *who worships the Father in Spirit and in truth*, whereas a wicked mans plowing is as reall, and true, and good as to the matter, and nature of the outward action, as that of the good. It doth not therefore follow, that (according to the Q. principle) becauſe a man is not to pray without the Spirit, that therefore he is not to plow without the Spirit, in reſpect of the matter, although in reſpect of the defect in the manner, and laſt end, which should be the glory of God, he ſins when he plows, as when he prays, but yet not ſo much in the one, as in the other, for in the one both matter and manner are wrong, in the other not the matter, but manner, but if a man be faithfull to God, he may as certainly expect the divine aſſiſtance of the Spirit to help him to plow, as to pray, although that aſſiſtance to pray is greater, & of another manner then that to plow, as is obvious to any that hath ſpirituall experience. And whereas A. Sk. inferreth upon them, their going about the ſpirituall duties in a carnall manner, &c. this they call an impudent calumny but in this, the impudent calumny is their own, not his, for dare they deny but they are for going about prayer, & praiſe (which are ſpirituall duties) without the motion of the Spirit, which is as much as to ſay, in a carnall manner? for what is not done by the Spirit, is done but in a carnall manner, and wheras they call his ſecond anſwer, *a clear confeſſion &c.* yet they tell us nothing of it pag. 96. They are no leſſe disingenuous, in alledging, that G. K. *diſſenteth from* R. B. and A. Sk (whom in their aiëry and frothy minds they call *his pretended infallible brethren*) for as G. K. requireth inſpirations to the

the acceptable performance of other actions, ſo doth A. Sk. and R. B. yet we all ſay, wicked men may very lawfully goe about naturall and civill performances, as to plow, to eat, to pay debts, as they are materially conſidered, without inſpiration, and in ſo doing (although they fall short of acceptable performance, for defect of the right manner, and the laſt end) they ſin leſſe, then to omitt thoſe actions, and indeed ſin not at all, as to the nature and ſubſtance of them, as they doe, who pray without inſpiration.

As for G. K. his diſtinction of Mandatory and permiſſory inſpirations, it holds good, notwithſtanding all their idle, foolish and impertinent cavilling at it; From the words of Paul that he eſſayed to goe to Bithynia, but the Spirit permitted him not; G.K. inferred by the rule of contraries, that the Spirit ſometimes permitted him, To evade this, they are ſorely pinched, in their *Account of the diſpute* pag. 30. *they grant his conſequence, that Paul at ſometimes had a permiſſion, but they deny it to be an inſpiration.* But here in this new aſſault, *they deny that any permiſsion followeth by the rule of Contraries, from Pauls words*, alledging *that he permitted him, and he permitted him not are not contraries.* But G. K. did not alledge theſe to be contraries, for they are flatt contradictory, but theſe we ſay are contraries, *the Spirit permitted not Paul to goe to Bithynia*, therfore he permitted him to goe ſometimes, to ſome places. This is a plaine inference, from the rule of contraries, by *Contraries*, we mean not contraries in the ſtrict logicall ſenſe, as when the contrariety is betwixt two univerſalls, but oppoſits, which in the common way of ſpeech are called contraries, and in the Logicall ſenſe may be called, ſubcontraries, which doe inferre one another not to be true alwayes *ſimul & ſemel*, at one time, and place, but at divers times and places, &c. As for example, if there be a South, ther muſt be a North, if a time to come, ther is a time to be paſt, if ſome things be hott, and not cold, other things muſt be cold and not hott, and to uſe a more neare example to the matter in hand, if when a River is not permitted to runn, by reaſon of an exceſſive freezing that bindeth it up, at one time, it followeth that it is permitted to run at another time, when ther cometh a thaw, or yet to come nearer, If the wind do not permitt a shipp to ſaile southward, at one time, it doth permitt her at another time, to ſaill

ſouthward. We would not have inſiſted on ſuch rudiments, had not the great ignorance of the Students occaſioned it,

Pag. 97. They cloſe their 9. §. moſt pitifully, after having failed to refute G. Ks. diſtinction of permiſſory and mandatory inſpirations, they ſay, *they leave it to be proved by G. K. that the ſimple permitting of him* (meaning permiſſion not joined with a command) *hath been by inſpiration.* Here they shamefully deſert their undetaking, which was to refute permiſſive inſpirations, but when they faill to doe this, they put G. K. to prove them, whereas they ought to remember, that G. K. is not bound by the law of Diſpute, to prove any thing, being a meer defendant, yea when he offered *ex abundanti* to prove ſomething in the Diſpute, they blamed him for ſo doeing, being but a defendant, and now they would have him leave Defendant, and become Opponent. This is a pitifull confutation of the Qu: principles, that when they fall ſhort in their proofes againſt us, put us to prove our own principles, but ſeing they are ſo beggarly, as to begg from G. K. a proofe of this, he ſhall give it uuto them, and it is this. Admitt then, that according to the Students ſuppoſition, Paul was permitted to goe unto a certain place, without any command of God, and that Paul did this acceptably, or without ſin, as to the thing it ſelfe, which they muſt needs acknowledge he might; it followes then by their own argument that he walked this journey in the Spirit, ſeing they themſelves plead *that men ought to walke in the Spirit, meaning outward walking*, and ſeing they grant, that *whatever act a man doth acceptably, he muſt doe it to the glory of God*, and that a man can doe nothing to the glory of God, but as he doth it from a good principle, (yea the glory of God being a ſupernaturall end, muſt have a ſupernaturall principle) which is the Spirit of God, it manifeſtly followeth, that Paul his journeying by a permiſſion was by inſpiration, for whatever is done in the Spirit, is done by inſpiration, *inſpiration* both in the common ſenſe, and here particularly ſignifieing *any gracious motion, influence and aſſiſtance of the Spirit.* In their anſwer to that other Scripture 1 Cor. 7: 6. compared with ver. 40. they fall into their old way of aſſerting barely without any proofe, they tell us, *that the permiſſion falls upon the thing ſpoken, and not upon the ſpeaking it ſelfe.* But how prove they it? Here they are quite dumb, and ſay nothing for proofe, and indeed it is as manifeſt as a thing can be, that the permiſſion doth no leſſe fall upon *the ſpeaking*, then upon *the thing ſpoken*, and they doe moſt preſumptuouſly

ouſly contradict the Apoſtle, when they ſay, *Paul was commanded to ſpeake this, whereas Paul ſaid expreſly, he ſpake by permiſſion, and not of commandment.*

In the proſecution of their ſecond argument, they bring in G. K. *diſtinguishing betwixt privative and poſitive permiſſion*, where they give the lye to their owne *Accompt*, which ſaith pag. 30. *that G. K. diſtinguished permiſſion into Poſitive and Negative*, as indeed he did. Now *Privative* and *Negative* differ widely, for the want of ſight in a ſtone, is not *privative* (as in a man) but *negative*, and ſurely there is ſo *little witt*, or *acumen* in this argument of the Students, and their proſecution of it, that it proves them to be liker ſtones then men of reaſon and ſolidity,. And here they tell us, that G. K. (whom in their vain minds they call this great inſpired Rabbi) *was very unfortunat, in explaining this diſtinction, and aſſigning its ground*, as may be ſeen in their *Accompt*: but alas! for them poor men, they have egregiouſly baffled themſelves in that very matter in their *Accompt*, as is ſhewed in our anſwer thereunto. But behold what *dull* and *heavy diſputers* theſe men are. *If Poſitive permiſſion were inſpiration*, ſay they, *then a man might inſpire us, for he might poſitively permitt us.* This conſequence is as dull and heavy as a ſtone, although the weight of it falls not upon us, but upon themſelves to prove them altogether impertinent; for their argument proceeds upon a wrong ſuppoſition, that according to G. K. *all poſitive permiſſions are inſpirations*, a thing G. K. never dreamed of, but only that ſome poſitive permiſſions, to wit, *thoſe of God, are inſpirations*, as he by his Spirit doth permitt men, or allow them to doe or uſe ſome things, as when God ſaid to Adan in the garden, *of every tree in the garden thou mayeſt freely eat, ſave one*; This was a *poſitive permiſſion*; and alſo (if God ſpake this to him inwardly, as is moſt probable, and as Auguſtin ſuppoſeth) an *inſpiration*; alſo when the Lord ſaid unto Ezekiel cap. 4: 15. *Lo, I have given thee cows dung for mans dung*, this was a condeſcendece and *poſitive permiſſion*, and alſo an *inſpiration*. But the Students proceed ſtill more and more to baffle themſelves (in ſtead of baffling the Qu.) and ſhew their ignorance and ſottiſhneſſe. For thus they argue, pag. 99. in proſecnting their third argument: *every inſpiration* (ſay they) *puts us out neceſſarily to the doeing of the thing inſpired, and ſo commands us virtually.* And upon this bare alledgance the whole ſuperſtructure of this argument ſtands, which yet is a manifeſt untruth, and

ſuffer-

ſuffereth many undenyable exceptions: for many times things inſpired are not at all of the nature of things to be done, but are ſimply things to be believed, as when God inſpired the Prophets with the knowledgs of things to come, which neither could nor ought to be done by them, and as when Daniel was inſpired to know things, which he was ſo farre from being commanded to write, that he was forbidden Dan. 12:4. Again ſome inſpirations are meer inward conſolations, and ſpirituall refreshments and renewings of ſtrength only to enable us in generall to ſerve God, as meat and drink is unto the body, and that ſometimes without words, and ſometimes with words by way of promiſe, as when he ſpake to Noah Gen. cap. 9. from ver. 8. to ver. 18. where there is not any command given to Noah, but only promiſes, and yet Noah was inſpired by the Lord, as all the true Prophets were. And wheras they alledge that inſpiration includs in its notion an inſuperable putting and prompting out to the thing inſpired, in all authors both ſacred & profane, is meerly precarious, for ſometimes indeed it ſignifieth to command, as where the inſpiration is mandatory, but at other times it ſignifieth to comfort, refresh, quicken, influence and aſſiſt us, without any particular command to any particular action, yet we acknowledge the nature of all divine inſpirations in the children of God is to *incline, lead, move, drawe and guid them up more and more into unity with God, and ſo unto a further degree of holineſſ*, but not to determine them, unto all particular actions, and thus alſo their fourth Inſtance is diſproved, where they alledg that all inſpirations of God determine us to one extream, which is falſe, if they mean an extream in the particular act; if they mean an extream in the generall, as to doe all in charity, and to the glory of God, we grant it, but this doth not militate againſt what we affirme. Their other two inſtances are but the former upon the matter, repeated in a tautologicall way for want of new matter, and are ſufficiently anſwered above. And thus their ſilly and faint reaſonings in this argument are anſwered without any neceſſity of G. K. his returning to his bagge for new diſtinctions, as they ſcornfully but foolishly inſinuat.

Pag. 99. § 15. The Students tell us that *G. K. finding himſelf beſet with theſe inextricable difficulties, as it ſeems, miſplaces this diſtinction in their Account, and gives in another diſtinction of Particular and Generall inſpirations*, this is but their meer alleadgance, the diſtinction was right enough placed, as any may ſee by the nature and coherence of the account, no:

nor did G. K. ſee any difficulty in their argument at all, as indeed there is none in it. But let us ſee how they refute this diſtinction of *Generall* and *Particular inſpirations* or *influences*. Firſt they ſay, *he ſhall never be able to produce a ground for this diſtinction, out of Scripture*. A learned refutation indeed! and like unto their old way, of puting us to prove what they can not diſprove. May it not as wel ſuffice us to ſay, *They ſhall never be able to produce a ground out of Scripture againſt it, and the rather ſince we are defendants.* Secondly, *That which is called a generall inſpiration could not put us out to any particular thing*, ſay they. Anſwer, If by *puting us out* they mean, *determine us inſuperably or irreſiſtibly thereunto*, we grant, but this is no abſurdity. Thirdly, *They would alwayes leave us undetermined.* Anſwer, nor is this abſurd, for in things that are permiſſive and left to our freedom in the Lord to doe them, or not to doe them, we need not any thing to determine us, as to the particular act, but may determine our ſelves, being free agents, although as to the nature and kind of the act in generall, that it be in true love to God, and to his glory we are determined by the Lord.

Pag. 100. They are no leſſe unſucceſsfull in managing their other argument, in *comparing inward duties with outward*, for, whereas they alledge for a proofe of their *minor*, *that if we were not to go about inward duties without a previous ſenſible inſpiration, there would be a progreſſus* in infinitum. This hath beene ſufficiently anſwered above in the diſpute, that as to that inward duty of waiting, we can not ſuppoſe, that ever at any time an influence or inſpiration can be wanting, and this we ſay ſtill, we mean to true Chriſtians, who are faithfull unto God, and do faithfully improve his influences. As for others, if they want influences either to inward or outward duties, the cauſe is their unfaithfulneſſe, and ſo the way to have them upon all occaſions is to be faithfull to anſwer Gods call, who doth oft invite and call upon them, who are unfaithfull. But if they mean all inward duties, as meditation in many caſes, upon particular ſubjects, we deny that even true Chriſtians have alwayes particular inſpirations thereunto, nor is there any neceſſity to aſſert them.

Now let us take notice how they refute the diſtinction of generall and particular inſpirations. Firſt, ſay they, *There are no generall inſpirations as we have shewed already*, but that they have shewed no ſuch thing is already made apparent. Secondly, *ſuppoſing them, yet they being but generall, would not be a ſufficient ground for the particular inward duties*

of waiting, *desiring*: but how prove they this? No wise, but meerly affirme it, only they confound waiting, desireing and meditating together, wheras meditating is of a larger extent, and sometimes yea oft times requireth a speciall inspiration. Thirdly, say they, *the Scriptures produced by the Qu. prove alike as to outward and inward duties*: To this we answer, That as to some outward duties, it is true, as to others, false; as for example, to be clear in all outward conversation, is a continuall duty, and therefore we can never want an influence therunto, if we be faithfull, but to preach and pray in the church or assembly, with audible words, is not a continuall duty, nor yet a generall to all Christians, and therefor it hath not alwayes an influence to assist therunto. And here let the Reader note, that by a generall influence, or inspiration, we mean only such an influence, as serveth in generall for all ordinary actions that are to be generally performed in an acceptable manner, as the same spirituall influence that sufficeth me to eat in faith, fear, and love, sufficeth me also to plow, or doe any other mechanicall work, but the same doth not suffice me to preach, or expound Scripture, otherwise any ordinary Christian might doe so at any time, which our adversaries will not acknowledge. Now that preaching and praying in particular, require a superadded spirituall influence and inspiration, we prove thus: If men may have an influence or inspiration of the Spirit, to wait, fear and love God, and yet want an influence or inspiration to preach, and pray vocally, then the influence and inspiration to preach, and pray vocally, is a distinct superadded influence &c: But the first is true, therfore the second. The consequence of the first proposition is clear from that maxime *quorum unum potest esse absque alio* &c. *when of two things the one can be without the other, the two are really distinguished.* The second proposition is proved, 1. becaus all true Christians have an influence and inspiration to wait, feare and love God, but all true Christians have not an influence aud inspiration to preach and pray vocally in the church, this our adversaries can not deny. 2. Even a true Gospell minister may at times want *a door of utterance*, when in the time of this want he hath an influence or inspiration to wait, fear, and love God; therefor these two are distinct. The *antecedent* is clear in the case of Ezekiel (chap. 3:15,16.) *who sat seven dayes with the elders, having nothing to speake unto them from the Lord*, untill *at the end of the seven dayes the word of the Lord came unto him.* And Ezra *sat silent till the evening*

evening ſacrifice and then he kneeled down and prayed Ezra 9: 5. Alſo Paul deſired the Coloſſians to *pray* for him, that *utterance* might be given him; which clearly imports, that he had it not at all times, although at all times he had an influence or inſpiration to *wait*, *fear*, and *love God*. And David prayed that *God would open his mouth, and his lips ſhould ſhew forth his praiſe*. Iſaiah ſaid, that *God had given him the tongue of the learned* &c. Chriſt promiſed that he *would give his Apoſtles a mouth and wiſdome which all their adverſaries ſhould not be able to reſiſt*: all this ſignifieth an influence of the Spirit to ſpeake, which was not generall to all, nor permanent or perpetuall with them who had it, as is clear in the caſe of David, who declared, that he *was ſilent, and held his tongue even from good, untill the fire kindled in him, and then he ſpake with his tongue* Pſal. 39: 3. Yea what ſignifieth the coal wherewith *Iſaiah his mouth was touched*, but an inſpiration or influence of life, ſuperadded unto that generall influence which he had before? Now if our adverſaries ſay, *this was given nnto thoſe men in an extraordinary way, as being Prophets and Apoſtles, but is now ceaſed, ſince the Apoſtles dayes*. To this we anſwer 1. This is a plain acknowledgment that generall influences common to all Chriſtians are one thing, and particular influences given to holy men to preach and pray vocally, are another. But 2, that all influences and inſpirations or motions of the Spirit to enable miniſters to preach and pray vocally are not ceaſed ſince the Apoſtles dayes, is cleare from Rev. 11: 3. *And I will give unto my two witneſſes, and they ſhall propheſie*, and it is ſaid *that if any man hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth*, which muſt needs ſignifie a ſpeciall influence of the Spirit given them to propheſie or preach, which is not common to all Chriſtians. Alſo what are theſe gifts given unto miniſters for the perfecting of the ſaincts, but ſuch ſpeciall influences to enable them to preach, which are not given to all; yea do not the nationall preachers deſire in their publick prayers ſome ſpeciall aſſiſtance and help of the Spirit, to carry them forth in their miniſtry, which they have not before, for if they had it before, why do they ſeek it? From all which it is manifeſt, that as there are generall influences given to all, and at all times, ſo there are particular and ſpeciall given only to ſome, and but at ſome times. Moreover, that there is a greater influence of life required to vocall prayer, when it is acceptable, then unto ſome meer mentall prayer (a thing expreſſely denyed by the Students pag. 100. § 16.) is clear, becaus all true and acceptable

ceptable vocall prayer, hath mentall prayer going along with it, as its cauſe and ſpring, and ſo when any man prayes vocally, (if his prayer be true and acceptable) he prayeth alſo mentally, and ſo he doth two things together, whereas when he prayeth but mentally he doth but one thing. Now common reaſon teacheth us that more ſtrength is required to doe two things together, then to doe but one of them. And ſeing the vocall prayer hath not any life, or vertue in it, to reach unto Gods throne, or yet unto the hearts of his people, to quicken and refresh them, but as it receiveth that life, from the life that is in the mentall prayer, it is clear, that a greater meaſure is required to both, then ſimply to the one. Now although mentall prayer (as to the diſpoſition and frame of the ſoul at leſt) be alwayes in and with good Chriſtians, and hath alwayes ſome meaſure of life in it, yet that meaſure is ſometimes ſo weak and low, that it can not goe forth into the words, without hurt or prejudice, and at other times although it be able and ſtrong, yet it will not anſwer the motion of mans will, ſo as to be drawne forth thereby, but it only abideth or goeth forth into the vocall prayer, according to the will of God, as he pleaſeth to move it, therefore the free motion of the life it ſelfe, as it pleaſeth God to bring it forth, is to be attended in all outward ſpirituall performances: But here let the Reader note, that we have ſaid *Vocall prayer requires more life then ſome mentall prayer*, we do not ſay, *then all*, for *ſome* mentall prayer may be ſtronger then that which is a complex of mentall and vocall, as gathering the whole ſtrength of the complex into that which is ſolely and intirely mentall, according unto that common ſaying, aboundantly confirmed by experience, *vis unita fortior, united ſtrength is the ſtronger*, as when the beams of the ſun are united into a ſmall point, they have more force, then when they are diffuſed, and for this cauſe it is, that we are ſo much for mentall prayer, as knowing the great good of it in our experience. And from what is above ſaid, it is clear that we need another influence wherewith to *pray vocally*, then to *eat*, *plow*, *walk* &c. becaus theſe naturall actions may be done ſufficienty in a ſpirituall manner, by the help of that *generall influence*, which doth alwayes attend good men, to feare and love God, for the principle of divine life, which is the living and powerfull word of God in mens hearts, is never idle, but is alwayes operative, and at work, eſpecially more aboundantly in them who joyne with it, being as a moſt rich and living ſpring, that is continually flowing, and ſending forth its ſtreames, according

cording to Joh. 4:14. but to pray vocally requireth an influence of life to flow forth into the words, that it may in a liveing and powerfull way reach the hearers, but that *plowing*, *eating*, *walking*, &c. need no such emanating influence, is certain, and will be acknowledged by our adversaries. But perhaps alſo they will deny, that any life or virtue doth flow forth into mentall praying and preaching, even when theſe duties are acceptably performed. But this is contrary both to the certaine experience of many thouſands, and alſo to the Scripturs teſtimony in many places.

I It is contrary to the experience of many thouſands, who can declare, (whereof we are ſome) that the declarations, teſtimonies, and words of the ſervants of God, in preaching and praying have a reall life and living vertue in them, whereby their ſouls are exceedingly refreshed, quickened, and ſtrengthened, which life and living virtue is a thing as diſtinct from the bare outward words, which the naturall ear can hear, as wine is diſtinct from the veſſell that carrieth it, therfor if another man, that hath not this Spirituall ability, ſhould pronounce the ſame words, they have not any life or virtue at all: and that God had given this Spirituall diſcerning to many before the people called Q. were raiſed up, is manifeſt, from divers in our owne nation, who cared not to hear men, who could ſpeak never ſo good words, if they wanted life, and in that day, they could and did diſtinguish betwixt dead and living preachers, as alſo betwixt a living teſtimony and preaching, and a dry diſcourſe, ſee for this the book called, *The fulfilling of the Scriptures*. And this was the expreſſe teſtimony of that *Philoſopher*, who was converted by the means of a few words ſpoke by a certain old man, who was a Chriſtian, at the Councill of Nice, *out of the mouth that old man, (ſaid he) there went forth a virtue, which I could not reſiſt*, theſe were his very words, as *Lucas Oſiander* relats them in his Epitome of the Church hiſtory. Cent. 4. lin. 2. cap. 5.

II. It is contrary to the Scriptures teſtimony in many places, *The mouth of the righteous is a well of life* Prov. 10:11. this muſt be underſtood in reſpect of the influence of life, that cometh out of his mouth, as water doth out of a well, and not barely in reſpect of the good words, which a wicked man may ſpeak: according to this Chriſt ſaid to his diſciples, *The words that I ſpeak unto you are ſpirit and life*, and as it was then, ſo it is now, for at this day he ſpeaketh in his ſervants, and will to the end of the world, and it is he only, who hath *the words of eternall life*, which he ſpeaketh in

his ſervants, and as in the dayes of his flesh, he was ſaid *to ſpeak with authority, or power and not as the ſcribes*, and the people *wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth*, all which import a liveing influence and vertue in the words of Chriſt, which the words of the Scribes and Phariſees had not, ſo it is at this day, for Chriſt doth as really ſpeake by his Spirit, in his ſervants, as he did in his body of flesh, ſo that Paul ſaid, *he ſpak in him*, and therefore his preaching was *in demonſtrtion of the Spirit and power*. And for this cauſe true Preachers and Prophets are called *good trees*, *of which men gather good fruit*, whereas *bad men or evil trees*, *having no good fruit*, although they have the Prophets and Apoſtles words, alſo they are compared, to wit, the falſe Prophets, *to clouds without rain* and *wells without water*, although they have good words, yet they have no rain nor water, their whole miniſtry is dry, and empty of life and virtue, but the true Prophets miniſtry is *as a ſhower of rain*, Deut. 32:2. and ſometimes it is compared unto *fire*, as it is ſaid in the Pſalme, he maketh his angels, or meſſengers, ſpirits, and his miniſters a flamme of fire, and fire was ſaid to goe out of the mouths of the two witneſſes. Alſo the influences of life that go forth through the true prophets in their *miniſtry* are compared to *golden oil*, & the *men* are compared *unto golden pipes*, Zech. 4:12. And therefore the Apoſtle Peter exhorted the miniſters in his day *to miniſter of the ability which God giveth*, *as good ſtewards of the manifold grace of God*, ſo they miniſtred not only *words*, but *grace*; many other teſtimonies might be cited to prove this truth.

Another inſtance brought by the Students, is, *that an haretick forbearing prayer a year or two*, *or his whole life time*, *may juſtifie himſelfe by this doctrine*. To this it was anſwered, that though he may pretend, yet he hath no juſt ground from our principle, for we believe that all men are bound to pray often unto God, yea daily, and that God doth inwardly call and move all men often unto prayer, during the day of their viſitation, and when that is expired, or when at any other time they want that inward call, or influence, through unfaithfulneſſe, they are ſtill bound, and if they pray not, they ſin, becaus they ought to have an influence. But that our *Account* ſaith, All have not utterance to pray in words, is no excuſe for hereticks, for they muſt needs acknowledge, as wel as we, that all have not utterance, who may be good Chriſtians, ſeing ſome that are naturally dumb may be good Chriſtians, and yet they

muſt

muſt confeſſe theſe have not utterance; alſo many good Chriſtians, who have no naturall impediment, do want utterance in a ſpirituall way, to ſpeak or pray vocally in the hearing of others, at ſome times, although we believe it is given at times to all that are faithfull, who have no naturall defect, that they may pray vocally, or in the hearing of others: but how oft, it is more then we can determine, ſeing it is not revealed, but if any faile of this utterance, through unfaithfulneſſe, their ſin is nothing the leſſe, if they omitt prayer. And thus their laſt two inſtances are alſo anſwered, for we do affirme with great freedome, that all who are faithfull to the Lord, never want ſufficient inſpiration, or influence to *wait upon God*, *fear him*, *love him*, *deſire his grace*, and divers other inward duties. We ſay not all, for ſome inward duties, ſuch as meditation on a particular ſubject or place of Scripture are not alwayes required, more then it is alwayes required to ſpeak; but if they be unfaithfull, we deny not, but they may and will want them, and in that caſe, although they want inſpirations and influences they are bound to pray, yet not without them, but with them, as a man that wanteth both money and goods to pay his debt, yet is bound to pay his debt, yet he muſt not, nor ought to pay it, without money, or goods, the example is clear, and the application is eaſy. As for that ſtory they bring in concerning T. M. which, that their deceit may be the more hide, they do not poſitively affirme, but only propoſe by way of queſtion, *have not Q. declared to people* &c. To which we anſwer, that we know not that any Qu. ever declared any ſuch thing and we believe divers things in the ſtory are utterly falſe. If T. M. or any other of our profeſſion, having none in the family that can joyne with them in the true ſpirit of prayer, but are profeſſed oppoſers of the Q. way, be not ſo frequently heard pray by them, is excuſable by your oune way, who will not readily pray in our hearing when they have none to joyne with them, and indeed the want of that true unity on the part of thoſe who are not of our faith, doth oft hinder our freedome, to pray in their hearing, (unleſſe we have ſome of our faith, preſent to joyne with us) we may pray for them, as it pleaſeth God to move us, in their hearing, but we can not ſo properly pray with them as not being in unity with them, *where two or three* (ſaid Chriſt) *agree together to ſeek any thing in my name*, but let our adverſaries if they can, ſhew us, where in the Scripture, it is commanded, for any man, to pray, in the hearing of others where all preſent have no agrement with him, yet

wee

we deny not, but that God upon ſome ſolemne occaſion may move to ſuch a thing, eſpecially when a publick teſtimony is required, as in the caſe of Stephen, who prayed audibly in the hearing of others, all which were ſo far from having any agreement with him, that they were at that time ſtoneing him to death; *Acts* 7. Moreover we could eaſily, upon a more juſt ground retort the queſtion upon your own Church members, how many of your owne church members were not only for a twelve moneth, but for many 12 moneths, never heard pray, and yet they paſſe among you for good Chriſtians? It is wel knoune, that although ye hold family prayer, morning and evening to be a duty, and the want of it a great ſin, that yet many thouſand families in the nation, who belong to your church, want it, and many whole families are ſo groſſly ignorant, that none in the family can go about it, even in that natural way, which ye plead for. As for us, it doth ſuffice unto us, that God heareth us in ſecret, although men do not ſo frequently hear us; yet we oune with all our hearts publick expreſſive prayer, as it is performed in Spirit and in truth, and all of us, have our share and teſtimony therein, as God moves thereunto, even thoſe who are outwardly ſilent, as they who ſpeak, when as both agree together in one ſpirit, and with one heart and ſoul joyne together in the ſame.

SECTION SIXTH.

of BAPTISM.

Wherein their fourth Section concerning water Baptiſm, is anſwered.

IN their ſtating the queſtion, they ſay, *the queſtion* is not, *whether Infants ought to be baptized, or who have the power of adminiſtring baptiſm*; whereas indeed theſe two are a great part of the queſtion betwixt our adverſarie and us, for as touching infant baptiſm R. B. his *Theſis* doth expreſſly ſay, it is a meer human tradition; and it is wel knowne that all the Quakers ſo called are of the ſame mind, and do not the Students undertake to confute ehe Q. principles, how is it then

that they leave out ſo conſiderable a part of Quakeriſm, as they call it? Is this *Quakeriſm canvaſsed*, to pick and chuſe at ſome, and paſſe by others? Yea Infants-ſprinkling with water on the forehead, is ſo conſiderable a part of the queſtion betwixt them and us, that if that be diſproved, or if they can not prove that to be a Goſpell inſtitution, they fall short exceedingly, ſeing that is the only baptiſm, in uſe among them of the nationall Church. Again, it is ſo great a part of the queſtion, who have the power of adminiſtring baptiſm, that by this, the controverſie ſtands or falls, for one of our maine arguments againſt water-baptiſme as remaining a duty, upon all Chriſtians, is, that none are to be found that have the power to adminiſter it; and the adminiſtration cannot be with a lawfull adminiſtrator, the queſtion then really is, whether theſe who have no immediat call to adminſter water baptiſm, (as John had) have power to adminiſter it. Again, whether theſe, who have no other mediat call to baptize, but what they have by the church of Rome which is no true church, as the beſt Proteſtants affirme, have power to adminiſter baptiſme, and this queſtion is the more proper in this place, ſeing I. M. the Students maſter confeſſeth *his and his brethrens call and ordination to be by the church of Rome, and that they have no other, but what is conveyed downe to them from the Apoſtles times by that apoſtate church*. But let us now examine their arguments for water baptiſme in generall: The firſt is, *Baptiſme with water is to continue in the church as long as Chriſts preſence is to continue with his Apoſtles, and them who teach the doctrine that they taught: But Chriſts preſence is to continue with his Apoſtles, and them who teach the doctrine that they taught, to the end of the world, Therefore* &c. Where it is to be obſerved, that they think all is ſafe as to the *minor*, and therefore they altogether paſſe it by Now although it is ſufficient to invalidat the argument, if the *major* be falſe, yet we have ſomewhat of great moment to ſay to the *minor*, that is enough to overturne any baptiſme that they have; for we put them to explaine, who theſe are, that all along ſince the Apoſtles, have taught the doctrine, which the Apoſtles taught, for the words are lyable to divers ſenſes. If they mean the church of Rome, and her bishops and teachers, we altogether deny that they have taught the ſame doctrine, which the Apoſtles taught, and we ſuppoſe the Students, if they follow their maſter I. M. will not affirme it. And indeed for the ſame reaſon, the beſt primitive Proteſtants denyed that the church of Rome in their day had any lawfulll ordination at all, ſeing she

continued not in the Apoſtles doctrine, and faith, as that famous Proteſtant *Sadeell* doth argue at great length, lib. *de legit. voc. min.* where „ *he affirmeth, that the ſucceſſion of faith is as the ſoul, which gives life* „ *to the ſucceſſion of the biſhops as unto a body, but that ſucceſſion without* „ *this faith, is a dead thing, and unprofitable carcaſe.* Now the ſame reaſon doth militate as ſtrongly againſt *Water-baptiſm*, and that alſo called the *ſupper*, upon our preſent adverſaries principle, that none have power to adminiſter the one or the other, but thoſe who have a mediat outward call, conveyed downe from the Apoſtles, by a viſible ſucceſſion of ordained Biſhops and Presbyters, for we ſay, There hath been no ſuch viſible ſucceſſion, nor viſibly ordained Biſhops and Presbyters, who all along have had the true faith, and taught the true doctrine of the Apoſtles, therefore their ordination, and power to adminiſter the Sacraments, is void and null. And this is further confirmed by the authority of *Cyprian*, who taught with great earneſtneſſe, that the *baptiſme of all hereticks was void, and no baptiſme*, but ſo it is, by our adverſaries confeſſion, that the Church and biſhops, and teachers of Rome have been Hereticks for many hundred years, before the reformation, Therefore &c. We ſay then, the argument is fallacious, as to the *Minor* ſuppoſing what is not to be ſuppoſed in their ſenſe, *videlicet*, that either the teachers of the church of Rome, or any other claiming a viſible and mediat call, from the Apoſtles times conveyed through a viſible church unto them, have thaught the doctrine, which the Apoſtles taught; a thing we altogether deny, and it lyeth on them to prove, But that Chriſt hath had ſome all along, who have both believed and taught the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and that his preſence has been with them, we acknowledge, but we deny that theſe have been all along a viſible church, and teachers having a mediat call and ordination, and in this we agree with the beſt Proteſtants, for indeed the true church hath been hidd, even as a few grains of corne among an exceeding great quantity of chaff, and ſtubble, and she who hath called her ſelf the church, by reaſon of her outward ſucceſſion, was not the true church, though ſome of the true church lay hidden in her, as corne is hid in a great quantity of chaff, and that the church is properly to be placed in the alone graines of corne, and not in the chaffe, *Sadeell* doth alſo shew out of *Auguſtine*, Epi. 48. Another fault wee find in the Students argument, that ſuppoſeing Waterbaptiſm had been commanded to the Apoſtles, by Chriſt Matth. 28.

(which

(which yet we altogether deny) it insinuateth that *it was as long to continue as Christs presence, with his church*, for if teaching had continued, though Baptism with water had discontinued (as our adversaries grant that anointing with oile, and miraculous curing the sick, is discontinued) yet the promise was ground enough to encourage them, and if all be still binding that Christ commanded to his Apostles, why go they not forth, (we mean the nationall teachers) into all the world, and teach the nations, who do not so much as believe the Gospell historically: If they say, this was a command to the Apostles, and not to them, why are they so partiall as to take one part to them, and reject another? But we shall now come to a more particular examination of their *Major*, we have told them, that the Apostles baptized some with water, out of a condescendency, as Paul circumcised Timothy, and not from that command, Matth. 28. which saith nothing of *Water-baptism*; Their first reason against this, is, *they should have Baptized with water of their owne will and without any sufficient authority*. But we deny this consequence, and they themselves have furnished us with a sufficient answer, where they say *Paul circumcised Timothy but not without a command, for the Law of charity, and other generall precepts obliged Paul so to doe, though it was a thing indifferent of it selfe*: the same we say, as to their baptising with water, the Jewes having so great an esteeme of *Water-baptism*, and thinking it necessary, the *Apostles* used it, although it was a thing indifferent of it selfe, after Christs ascension, and giving of the holy ghost, the Law of charity, and other generall precepts oblidging them, but this proveth not, that the Apostles had any command from Matth. 28. or any such command any where else, that made *Water-baptism* of it selfe, to be a necessary duty, to the end of the world. And wheras they querie, *will G. K. grant, that it was once lively*. We answer, yes under John, yet it followeth not that it was to continue, becaus John had no commission to the nations, but only to the Jews, and that the Apostles Baptized whole families and thousands (if they so did) will not prove, that it was necessary of it selfe, more then that Circumcision was, and yet even then, many thousands of believing Jewes, were Zealous for Circumcision, see Act. 21: 20, 21. yea many *Bishops of Jerusalem* were circumcised after this, as Eusebius relats, the reason therfor was, that people were Zealous of Water-baptism, becaus of John, and therfor the Apostles condescended to it, out of the law of charity. Another question they

make, *where is water baptiſm buried*? We anſwer, where the other ſhaddowes are buried, for it was but a shaddow, and *carnall ordinance*, Heb. 9: 10. the Greek word is βαπτισμοῖς. Again the true water baptiſm hath been out of uſe all the time of the Apoſtaſie, for the apoſtate church hath had no true baptiſm, and ſo in that reſpect it hath been buried, and being but a shaddow, is not to be raiſed up again, And it is obſervable, that in the *revelation*, wher it is propheſied, of the returne and reſtoration of the church, ther is not any thing mentioned of the reſtoring either *Water-baptiſm*, or the uſe of *bread and wine*, as ſigns, &c. And ſo their ſecond reaſon is anſwered, that *Water-baptiſm* is no more to be uſed, out of condeſcendency to the weak, then *circumciſion*, becaus both are long agoe buried, and what is buried is deadly to be raiſed up again, as *Auguſtin taught*. Their third reaſon is built on a miſtake, that *the God head of Chriſt, or names of Father, Son, and holy ghoſt were a ſtumbling block to the beleeveing Iewes*, for of theſe only *we are to be underſtood*, alſo that the Apoſtles uſed the words *Father Son*, and *holy ghoſt*, when they baptized, can not be proved, farre leſſe uſed they, the word *Trinity*, which was not invented long after the Apoſtles dayes: Their ſecond argument that *the baptiſme commanded* in Matth. 28: 16. is *with water, reſolves at laſt into this, that it is God only and not man, who baptiſes with the holy ghoſt, becaus he is only the proper, immediat efficient cauſe of baptiſm with the holy ghoſt*, but wee deny the conſequence as weak and falſe, for ther is nothing more uſuall then to aſcribe the effect unto the inſtrumentall cauſe, as truly as unto the principall, Paul was ſent *to turne or convert the Gentiles from darkneſſe to light, and to open their eyes*, and yet God only was the proper and immediat efficient cauſe of this. Many more examples could be given, yea the ſame reaſon of the Students would militate againſt teaching, for even outward teaching, which is by the motion of the holy ghoſt hath a power, and vertue in it, wherof the men who teach, are but the inſtrumentall conveyers, that is only from God, as the immediat efficient cauſe. Another reaſon they give to make all ſure, as they ſay is, that it is *only Chriſt, as he is God, and mightier, then John, who baptiſed with the holy ghoſt*, Matth. 3: 11. where *baptiſm with the holy ghoſt* is peculiarly attributed to Chriſt. But this makes their matter nothing more ſure, for although that baptiſm with *the holy ghoſt* be peculiarly attributed to Chriſt as the principall cauſe, yet it hindereth not that men are the inſtrumentall, even as Chriſt ſaid, *it is not ye that ſpeak*,

and

and yet they also spake as instruments. It is true, that John did not baptize with the holy ghost as the Apostles did, or rather Christ through them, becaus John had not so powerfull a ministry given him, as the Apostles, of whom Christ said, that they should not only doe as great works, as he, but *greater*, to wit, by his power. Again, They argue, *that giveing and not granting, that baptism with the holy Ghost could be administred by men, yet it is not commanded here for the words then would be full of needlesse tautologies.* To this we answer, that this doth not follow, for suppose that by *teaching* and *baptizing* were meant one thing; how usuall is it in Scripture to expresse one thing under divers names, without any tautologie? However we believe that by *teaching* and *baptizing* are meant two severall things, both which require the speciall operation of the *holy Spirit*, for a man through teaching, by the concurrence of the *holy ghost* is first of all convinced of the truth, and hath a ground laid in him to believe, and then he is *baptized* with the *holy ghost*, upon his believing and obeying in what he is convinced of; nor is this to confound the command with the promise, for the sense of it is this, *goe ye and baptize with the holy ghost instrumentally, and I shall be with yow, as the Principall cause to concurre and assist yow*, and thus there is no tautologie, the *command* and the *promise* being *in diverso genere*, id est, in a different kind.

Their next argument to prove, that *Water-baptism* is to continue *to the end of the world, is, that God sent Iohn to baptize with water, and Christ caused Iohn baptize him and commanded or caused his Apostles baptize with water, and these commands were never formally repealed, nor ceased of their owne nature*, Therfor. But to this the Answer is easie, for *Johns baptism*, was no part of the *Gospel dispensation*, as serving onely to prepare the way to Christ, and he was sent only to baptise the Jewes, *that Christ might be manifest to Israel*, Joh 1: 31. and it is called *Johns baptism* in distinction from that of Christ, for *some were baptized with it*, who had not received *the holy ghost*, and that Christ was baptized *with water*, proveth not its continuance, no more then that he was circumcised, proveth the continuance of Circumcision: that Christ commanded his disciples to baptize with water, we find not, and though it were, it is but as at that time being under Johns dispensation, but unlesse they can prove that Christ commanded to baptise *all nations with water, and that to the end of the world*,

they gain nothing, for what was commanded only as toward the *Iewes*, doth not reach us gentiles, and ſo we need ſeek no repeal, there not having been any ſuch command.

In their anſwering our retortion, as touching *washing the feet, anointing the Sick w th oil, and abſtaining from blood, and things ſtrangled*, They ſay, 1. *This retortion hath a damnable tendency, for enthuſiaſts may ariſe and plead the ſame way againſt the moſt neceſſary truths*, &c. We anſwer, They have no ground from our retortion ſo to doe, becaus, theſe things above mentioned are but figures, and ſuch as have no inward, or intrinſecall goodneſſe, or righteouſnes in them, as the other things have, which are moſt neceſſarie. 2. Wheras they ſay, *If theſe things had been commanded. and never repealed, it were better to admitt and obſerve them, then to reject Baptiſm*, &c. We anſwer, if by repeal, they mean a formall repeal, we deny that it were better, for all being but figurative things, and ſuch as the inward Law of God writt in our hearts, which is the new covenant diſpenſation, doth not require of us, they ceaſe of their owne nature, and carry a virtuall repeal in their boſome, although it be not formally expreſſed in the Scripture, as to every particular, for all the things of the ceremoniall Law, are not one by one particularly repealed in the new Teſtament; but together in one body, for the Law it ſelfe being changed, the things required by it, if they have no other Law to require them, doe ceaſe. 3. They ſay, *That Chriſt in washing his diſciples feet did 2 things. 1. To ſeal up to his diſciples their part in him. 2. He intended to leave them one example of humility, and it is onely this ſecond thing, which he commanded, to his diſciples*, to wit, *that they ſhould performe acts of humility, one to another.* But wee miſſe their proofe there altogether, that he only commanded this, and not the washing one anothers feet in particular, yea this gloſſe expreſly gives the lye to Chriſt his owne words Joh. 13:14. *ye alſo ought to wash one anothers feet*, where not only an act of humility is ſignified, but an act of love, and alſo by the outward washing of the outward feet, is ſignified, how we ought to contribute to wash one anothers feet in a ſpirituall ſenſe that is to ſay, by ſeaſonable reproofs and exhortations to help on, one another, unto the ſanctification of the moſt inferiour affections, that are as it were the feet: and that Chriſt pointeth at ſuch a myſtery, is clear, from ver. 10. *He that is waſhed, needeth not ſave to wash his feet.* Again they alleege, that this act is put *ſynecdochically*, for all other acts of humility;

lity; but admitt, that it be ſo, this proves not, that this particular act was not commanded, when Chriſt inſtituted the breaking of bread, at ſupper; among other ends, it had this alſo, to ſignifie the unity of Chriſtians, and how they ought to love one another; shall we therefore ſay, it is *ſynecdochically* put for all acts of love, but is not particularly commanded? And indeed as washing of feet was in uſe, in theſe hot countreyes, before that Chriſt did wash his diſciples feet and commanded it to them, ſo was that in uſe, the chief in the family, to take bread and break it, and give to every one, ſaying, *take, eat*; this was in uſe among the Jewes, before Chriſt did ſo, as divers hiſtorians relate, particularly *Paulus Ricius de cœleſti agriculturâ*. Again, wheras they ſay, *If he had commanded ſo, ſome wold have obſerved it.* To this we anſwer, ſome yea many did obſerve it, as they grant *Ambroſe* and the church of *Millain* did, for if they uſed to doe ſo, in the eaſtern countreyes, where ther was need for it, becaus the people ordinarily did goe barefoot, the Chriſtians in that countrey would uſe it the rather that Chriſt commanded it, yea it doth appear, that it was a moſt ordinary thing in the primitive times from Pauls words 1 Tim. 5: 10. where it is numbered among other commanded duties, *if she hath washed the ſaincts feet.* If it be ſaid, that they uſed it, but not as a *Sacrament*, we anſwer, wee read not of the word *Sacrament* in the Scripture, it is enough that they uſed it, and were commanded ſo to doe by Chriſt, and it had a Spirituall ſignification, as well as theſe things they call *Sacraments.* It is needleſſe for us to inſiſt more on this particular, ſo as to refute arguments of their owne making, which are none of ours, wherin they fight with their owne shaddow, where wee leave them, and proceed to the other particulars. They tell us, *that the command to anoint the ſick with oil, carries a repeal in its boſome*, ſo we ſay, doth *Iohns Baptiſm with water*, as preparing the way to Chriſt, who is now come, and ſo wee may returne them theire axiome *ceſſante fine legis, ceſſat & obligatio*, but that *anointing with oil was only in order to miraculous cures*, they ſay it, without giving any proofe, Ja. 5: 14. for although it were confeſſed, that it were in order to outward healing or curing, yet it is cleare from the text, that it was not excluſive of all other things, for it is not only promiſed that he *ſhall be ſaved*, but if *he have committed ſins they shall be forgiven him*, and this saving ſeems rather to be ſpirituall, then the reſtoring the body to naturall health, otherwiſe it being abſolutely promiſed, all ſick perſons

in

in the church should have been alwayes restored to naturall health, and so none should have died, and we find anointing with oil joyned with prayer, yea *we are bidden pray one for another, that we may be healed*, nor is this ceased; but that by the prayers of the godly, for one that is sick, and bodily diseased, it pleaseth God at times, so to answer them, that they are restored to health by the Lord, and we dare our adversaries, if they will deny this altogether, and this is in a true sense miraculous, yea instances of this kind have been even among the people called Q. and if it were altogether ceased, according to the Students argument, prayer (at lest, so as to pray to God, to heal any sick person) should cease also. It is better therefore to say, *that anointing with oil is ceased, as being but a figure.* Their *repeal of the command to abstain from blood and things strangled*, is not sufficiently proved from 1 Cor. 10:25, for let any read the whole chapter, and he shall find nothing said in it *of blood, or things strangled*, that was not the subject, he was upon, but *things offered to idols*, which we read not, that they used to strangle: the sense is plain, *Whatsoever is sold in the shambles* (whether offered to idols, or not) *that eat, asking no question*, if it be offered to an idol, or not. Beside it is not usuall to sell flesh of beasts strangled in the shambles, for they kill them otherwise then by strangling, which is hurtfull to the meat; and if selling of strangled flesh had been usuall, it would have been no transgressing the Apostls rule, if they had any doubt, to have asked if it was strangled, for many will not eat flesh that is strangled, becaus it is not so good nourishment, although they have no scruple of conscience; yea the primitive Christians even in *Tertullian's* time, as he showeth in his Apologie, *abstained from blood and things strangled*, wherein there was a great providence of God to clear them of that horrid falshood, as if they did drink the blood of children. By which it is clear, they did not understand Pauls words 1 Cor. 10:25. to be any repeal. It is therefore more safe to say that *it being a part of the ceremoniall law, it is repealed with the other figures.*

The words of John, *He must increase, but I must decrease.* Joh. 3:30. they will not have to be understood of *Johns baptism*, wherein they are not only contrary to many of their own church, as could be showne, but also to the Scripture it selfe: for it is most clear, that *John* spake this with a particular relation to his *baptism*, when they came to him, and told him that Christ baptized &c. on this he said, that *Christ* was to *increase*, meaning

meaning *Christs baptisme*, not with *water*, but with the *holy ghost* (*for Christ baptized none with water himselfe*) and *he*, that is, his baptisme *must decrease*, not his true *honour* and *virtue*; and the disciples he gathered, was unto Christ, but that *Iohns baptisme* was much practised, proveth it no more a standing command, then other things of the Law.

In the last place they alledge, that *Peter commanded Cornelius and others with him to be baptized, out of necessity arising from a divine precept*, but their proofes are weak. For 1. we ought to doe all things in the name of the Lord, when we *eat*, or *drink*, or *journey*, but yet all things are not commanded, but some left to our fredome. 2. *Peter* in his sermon told *Cornelius* nothing of *water-baptisme*, and when that after he spoke of it, he did not tell him, that he ought to doe it out of a necessity arising from a divine precept, let them prove it if they can. 3. whereas they alledge that Peter was accused by the disciples, for administring *water baptism* to Cornelius, from Acts. 11. it is a manifest untruth, for there is no such thing either in their accusation, or his answer; as may be seen, if any will read the chapter; they accused him, for *going in to them, and eating with them*, and this was all the accusation, and though they had, the Students consequence doth not follow, for if the law of charity obliged him to *baptize* them, his refusall would have been a withstanding of God.

SECTION SEVENTH,

of the MINISTRY,

Being an Answer to their fifth Section Concerning the MINISTRY.

In the first part of their section, they plead that *a man, who is a hypocrite, and graceless, may be a true and lawfull Pastor*, yet they grant, that none ought to be admitted into the ministry, but such as *ex judicio charitatis*, id est, *out of the judgment of charity*, is to be esteemed truely pious, by which acknowledgment, they destroy with their owne hands any seeming strength, that lyes in their owne arguments, as will

 appear,

appear, by a particular examination of them. Their first reason is taken from *many Iewish Priests and high Priests, and many Scribes, and Pharisees in Christs time, who were ministers of Gods word, and yet who will say they were indued with sanct fing grac* ? To which we answer, that they were ministers of Gods word, or of the Gospell, is denyed, for they were but *ministers of the Law, and legall performances, types, figures and shaddowes*; and as that Legall dispensation was but imperfect, in respect of the Gospell, so the Priesthood and ministry of it, therefore both was to passe away; so that to argue from the *Law* to the *Gospell*, is not equall, more then to argue, that becaus *the ministers of the Law were ministers of the figures and types*, that therefore the ministers of the *Gospell*, should be the same, yea we may draw an argument from the outward and Legall qualifications of the Priests, that none but truely holy should, or ought to be ministers under the Gospell; for as under the Law, none were to be Priests, but these who came of *Levi*, a figure of Christ; so under the Gospell, none are to be ministers, but who by a spirituall birth and nativity, are of Christ. And as under the *Law*, none that were lame and blind corporally, were to be *Legall ministers*, so under the *Gospell*, none that are lame and blind spiritually, are to be *Gospell ministers*, but all that want true holinesse, are lame and blind spiritually, therefore. Again, many of these *Iewish Priests, Scribes and Pharisees*, were openly and manifestly impious, especially in the time of Christ his being in the flesh, and could not be esteemed truely pious, *in the judgment of charity*, and so if the argument hold, it proves that men be admitted, and owned to be *ministers of the Gospell*, that are not pious *in the judgment of charity*. The like may be said of *Iudas*, whom they take in their second argument, to patronize *a graceless ministry*, for if *Iudas* was a devil from the beginning, certainly Christ did know him to be so, and therefore could not *in the judgment of charity* esteeme him to be truely pious, how could he then admitt him? But as for Judas, they alledge indeed that he was a devil from the beginning, but they have not proved it; it is said expressly of him, that he *fell from* his ministry *by transgression*, we read not that he was degraded his office, any other way, but simply *by* his *transgression*, which was his betraying Christ. Again, it is written of him, *let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his Bishoprick let another take*. Psal. 109. But they who plead for a graceless Minister, would put another in Judas habitation, and so would hold up a ministry

of

of covetous men, as he was, who to satisfie their covetousnesse will betray Christ: for suppose, that a man have all other qualifications requisite, and yet be openly and notourly a wicked man, he may plead his right to be admitted, and if admitted to be continued to be a minister, what ground have his brethren, out of Scripture, to depose him, according to the Students argument, (which is indeed the generall argument of the clergie) (as they are called) seing he hath all the essentialls of a Minister? if they say, Paul requireth that a *Bishop, or Deacon be found blamelesse, not covetous, but vigilant, sober* &c: then it will follow, as much, that he that is not really pious, ought not to be admitted, as he that is not seemingly pious, for the Apostle doth not say, he must be seemingly so, but simply that he must be so, and indeed to expound all these qualifications of a seeming, and no reall holinesse, is to mock the Scripture, for they might as wel say, that seeming holynesse only, and not reall, is required indispensably of us, in order to salvation, for the Scripture as positively requireth holynesse, unto the function of a *Bishop*, as it doth require it unto salvation. There is yet another thing, which they have to prove, concerning Judas, *viz*, that *Christ sent him to preach the Gospell*. He sent him indeed to work miracles, heale the sick, and to say, *The kingdom of God is at hand*, that is to say, *the Gospell dispensation is approaching*; but that Judas was a minister of the Gospell, which is *the power of God unto salvation*, we require them to prove: for it was after his removall that Christ sent the Apostles to preach the Gospell. Their third reason is, that *the efficacy of the words depends not upon the worthinesse of the preachers* 1 Cor. 3: 7. We grant the *Antecedent*, but deny the *Consequence*, for although it depend not upon the worthinesse of the Preacher, yet it may and doth require holynesse, as a qualificatiou indispensably necessary in him, even as they grant themselves, that none are justified, without faith, yet they deny that the efficacy of justification depends upon the worthynesse of him that believeth, and the efficacy of good wine depends not upon the worthynesse of the vessell, that bears it, yet none will put good wine in a leaky vessell, or unfit, and indeed as unfit as a leaky, unclean vessel is to receive good wine, a graceless man is as unfit to receive the dispensation of the Gospell, which is compared to *new wine* in the Scripture, and said Christ, *no man putteth new wine into old bottles*, for indeed the ministration of the Gospell, is a ministration of life and grace, and none can minister that which they have not. Their

fourth argument depends upon a propoſition, which they lay downe, and offer to prove, but fall short in, *viz*, that *they can not know who have true grace*, this we deny, for if they would believe in the Light, wherewith Chriſt hath enlightened them, they should receive the Anointing, and by it their eyes should be opened to know, who are gracious, and who not. But let us ſee how they prove it. 1. Say they, *we can not know it immediately*, that is granted. 2. *Nor can we know it by their outward works, unleſs it be out of the judgment of charity, which may deceive us, for all the works which a godly man can doe, may likewiſe be performed as to the outward, by hypocrits.* To this we anſwer, It by *outward works*, they mean ſuch as come under the outward obſervation of the meer outward and bodily ſenſes we grant; but there are works, which are the fruits of the Spirit, which, although they remaine in the ſouls of holy men, yet ſend forth a ſavour of that life and Spirit, or ſpirituall principle, that is the root of them, through the outward works and converſation, which can and doe reach unto the ſpirituall ſenſes of others, where they are, and this ſavour and manifeſtation of life can no hypocrite have, but it is an infallible evidence of ſanctification in meaſure where it is, and where the ſanctification is greateſt the ſavour or manifeſtation of life is there greateſt alſo, according unto this, Paul ſaid, *we are a good ſavour, &c.* and Paul ſaid of the Corinthians, that *they were the epiſtle of Chriſt.* John ſaid of the Saints that *the name of God, and of the Lamb, ſhall be in their foreheads.* Many other teſtimonies could be brought to prove this, we ſhall only add that of Chriſt, *he that believeth in me, out of his belly ſhall flow rivers of living water.* So here is an evidence, that no hypocrite can have Now what are theſe *rivers*, but the influences of the Spirit, and ſeing they are ſaid to flow out, they may be diſcerned by others. It is true the naturall ſenſes can not diſcerne them, but the Spirituall ſenſes can, and ſeing the ſtudents grant ſpirituall ſenſes, if they grant them to be true and reall, they muſt grant alſo ſpirituall ſenſible objects, which may be as certainly apprehended, and diſcerned by our ſpirituall ſenſes, although the objects themſelves be without us, as naturall objects without us may be apprehended by the naturall ſenſes. 3. *Nor can we know it*, ſay they, *by revelation*, but how prove they it? They only ſuppoſe they have proved already that there is no ſuch thing, but how weak and impertinent their proofes are, is above ſhewed. But here note, that by *revelation*, is ſufficiently underſtood the revelation or diſcovery, which the fruits of the Spirit, or Spirituall life

life give forth in holy men one to another, for as the savour of some sweet oyntement is a sufficient revelation of it, to the sense of the naturall smell, so the Spirituall savour of the Spirituall oyntment, is such to the Spirituall smell. Lastly, wheras they say, *the gift of discerning Spirits, was never common to all.* This wee deny, nor doth that Scripture cited by them prove it 1 Cor: 12, 10. Otherwise they might as wel say, *that faith was not common to all true Christians*, becaus it is said, *to another, faith*, but as by [*faith*] here must be understood some extraordinary degree of faith, or the faith of miracles, so the discerning must be some extraordinary degree, or as in relation to miracles, seing there were Spirits of Devils that wrought false miracles, and such a discerning as to that, we doe not plead for, as common to all, but that a discerning of Spirits, so farre as to discerne betwixt them who were godly and wicked, and who were ministers of the Spirit, and who not, was common unto all, we prove, becaus it is promised as a generall priviledge, Mal 3: 18. *Then shall ye return and discern betwen the righteous and the wicked, &c.* Again, all are commanded *to try the Spirits*, 1 Joh 4: 1. Therefore all have a measure of discerning whereby to try them, otherwise they were required to doe an impossible thing, which is absurd, If it be said *He giveth a rule, whereby to try them, viz. every Spirit that confesseth that Iesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God*, ver. 2. To this we answer, the rule is one thing, the discerning is another, and differ, as the object, and the eye; Now the eye is as much required to see, as the object, Therefore all need a Spirituall eye, to apply the rule in a suteable manner, so as to know, who doe truly confesse Christ come in the flesh, for John can not mean a bare verball confession, becaus *Antichrist* himselfe may have that, therfore he meaneth a true living confession in life and power, which no hypocrite can have. Having thus answered all their arguments we shall conclude this particular with one argument against them, one part of which is their owne confession. They who can be certainly known and discerned, to be impious and unholy, ought not to be admitted into the ministry. But impious and unholy men can be certainly knowne to be impious and unholy, Therfore they ought not, &c. The first proposition is proved and sufficiently confirmed from their owne confession, that none ought to be admitted, but who

who in the judgment of charity are to be esteemed truely pious, therfore they who can not be so esteemed ought not to be admitted, but if they be certainly knowne to be impious, they can not be so esteemed, therefore &c. the *assumption* is proved above, partly by arguments, and partly by the refutation of what they have said against it.

In the second part they dispute against *an immediat enthusiastick call*, (as they call it) *by way of inspiration, being necessary, and for the necessity of a mediate and outward call*; and becaus we plead for the blessed inspiration of the Spirit of God, they call us *Enthusiasticall impostors*, and if the Apostles themselves and primitive Christians were now living, they would give them the same name: for we plead for no other inspiration, but that which was given unto those holy men. But seing they use the word *Enthusiasme* so much, in a way of reproach, it is fit, that it be opened, let them tell us then, if they mean any other thing by it, then *true divine inspiration*, if they mean another, it concerns us not, for we plead for no other, but if they mean that, (as the word properly signifies, being derived from a word, that signifies, *God within*, as the best Greek dictionaries shew) they should not reproach us with that, which was the glory of the primitive Christians, and by which the Scriptures were writ, *to wit*, divine inspiration. And here they tell us of an inward call, which consists in the disposition of the soul, but they will not have it to be an inspiration, but if by this *disposition*, they mean any spirituall or supernaturall gift, they must needs acknowledge that it is an inspiration, at least in the generall sense, for how can it be spirituall, unlesse it be inspired, is not every good thing, that is spiritually good, from the Spirit? Surely the nationall confession of faith, published in *Knoxes* time doth expressly say, that *faith is the Inspiration of God*: but if they say, they deny not *subjective* but *objective inspiration*, we put them to prove this unnaturall division, and separation; as if there were any inspiration in mens soules, that is not objective, which we altogether deny, but as to this inward call, we ask them, if it hath not in it the nature of a command, so that he who hath it, is bound to obey it: if they say, not, then a man may lawfully disobey it, and resist it, although it be of God: if they say, it is a command, then it is *objective*, for it is the nature of all reall and true commands to be *objective*. Again, if by *disposition*, they mean, the meer qualification that enabls a man to be a preacher, how can that be a call, seing a man may be fit or able for an office, that hath not a call thereunto,

being

being already in another office, that he is fit for also. So that they bewray groſſe ignorance, in confounding the *abil ty*, and the *call*, which are diſtinct things. And here they require of us to prove our immediate call by miracles, or any extraordinary thing, which can only be from God, and ſo cannot agree to falſe teachers. And it having been told them by R. B. that the Papiſts made the ſame objection againſt the firſt reformers, they call this *an impert nent prating*, but for all the diſparity, they ſhew, the impertinent pratling falls upon themſelves. They confeſſe the firſt reformers had an extraordinary c ll, in reſpect of their heroïck gifts, yet they alſo had a mediat call, They owned the holy Scriptures for their principall rule, and preached no other Goſpel, &c. To this we anſwer, that all of them had a mediate call, is a meer alledgance without any proofe, yea the hiſtory of the reformation sheweth the contrary. Again, it is abundantly evident out of their owne writings, that the moſt eminent of them did lay no weight upon that outward call, which ſome of them had, from the Popiſh church, but did plead, that ſeing the viſible ſucceſſion of the church, and miniſtry was interrupted by the apoſtaſie that they needed no outward call, but did betake themſelves to the extraordinary: ſee for this *Sadeell de legit: vocatione miniſtrorum*, and when they uſed any argument of a mediate call, it was but by way of *arg. ad hominem*, as now if any of us called Quakers hade ever had the mediate call, from the nationall churches, as ſome in England indeed had, namely S. F. who was a Parish prieſt, nor will it prove, that the firſt reformers had an extraordinary call, becauſe they owned the Scriptures as their principall rule, and preached no other Goſpell, otherwiſe all the nationall preachers now would have an extraordinary call, becauſe they pretend to owne the Scriptures as their principall rule, and to preach no other Goſpell, yea we owne the Scriptures as much as the firſt reformers did, and we do acknowledge them, that they are the principall externall rule, and to be preferred to all other outward writings and teſtimonies, but we can not preferre them, to the inward teſtimony and word of God in our hearts, as neither did the moſt eminent of theſe, called reformers, but indeed preferred the inward teſtimony and word to the outward, as is proved in the book called *Quakeriſme no Popery*. Now whatever proofe or evidence the firſt reformers could give of their exrtaordinary call, the Quakers can give the ſame: that, which they mainly inſiſted on, was the ſoundneſſe of their doctrinee, accompanyed with the holyneſſe of their life

life and good effect of their miniſtry, whereby ſoules were converted unto God, as *Sadeel* in the treatiſe above mentioned *de legit. voc. Min.* sheweth at length, and let our adverſaries diſprove this evidence, if they can, which we ſay is as good an evidence to us, as it was to them, and though falſe teachers may pretend unto the ſame, yet it can be proved, that it doth not juſtly belong unto them. As for *Popery* and *Mahumetaniſm*, it can be proved, that they are contrary to *Scripture*, but our adverſaries have not proved, nor can, that our doctrine is ſo, and we are moſt willing to bring the matter to this iſſue, we doubt not but to give better and ſtronger evidences from Scripture and reaſon to convince gainſayers in a rationall way, then our adverſaries can. But that we make the efficacy of our doctrine, taken preciſely by it ſelfe, and without being accompanied with the ſoundneſſe of it &c: an evidence of our Call, is a meer calumny of the Students.

Now let us ſee, what they have to ſay for *Their outward* and *mediate call.* They cite divers Scriptures to prove, that *the Apoſtles ordained Elders* but doth this prove, that their *ordination, which they derive from the apoſtate church of Rome*, is a true ordination, and neceſſary? Yea it is clear, and confeſſed by the moſt judicious *Proteſtants*, that true and lawfull ordination, and ſucceſſion hath not continued in the church ſince the Apoſtles dayes, but hath ſuffered an interruption by the generall apoſtaſie, that as a flood overflowed the earth, and that although God ſtill preſerved a church, yet she had not a viſible outward ſucceſſion, becaus she was not viſible all along here ſelfe, and before our adverſaries can make the halfe of their argument good, they muſt prove, that not only a true church hath continued ever ſince the Apoſtles dayes, but that she hath been viſible, having a true viſible ſucceſſion of viſible teachers, who were good and faithfull men, all along to convey it downe to this day. But to inferre that ordination hath continued, becaus of the command (if the command had been univerſall) doth not follow, ſeing many things commanded, may be unpractiſed, through unfaithfulneſſe, to the command. Now it is certain, that generally the viſibly ordained bishops have not been faithfull men for many hundred years, and ſo kept not to the ſubſtance of that true ordination, that was in the Apoſtles times, but loſt it, through unfaithfulneſſe, and ſet up a shaddowe in its roome, the like may be ſaid of other things. And the ordination being once loſt, it can not be recovered again, from a meer Scripture command, otherwiſe all may pre-

pretend to a power to ordain, for the Scripture doth not command one more then another, yea we find no generall command in Scripture for *ordination*, only that it was practiſed, which we deny not, and with it there was a *ſpirituall gift* of the *holy Ghoſt* conveyed, which was the main and only thing that made the ordination and laying on of hands effectuall, and without which it is but a shaddow, as may be ſeen at this day in the Nationall church, for who among them dare ſay, that they either give or receive that *ſpirituall gift of the holy Ghoſt*, which was then given and received therewith? 1 Tim. 4:14. Their ſecond argument is from Heb. 6. 1, 2. whereby they would inferre, that *laying on of hands is a part of the foundation of Chriſtianity*, but that Scripture ſaith no ſuch thing, for the *doctrine of Baptiſmes*, *and laying on of hands* relates to the 3 ver. as a thing that the Apoſtle intended to open, *and this* (ſaid he) *will we doe, if God permit*, whereas he had laid the foundation already, therefore the doctrine of the laying on of hands belongs not to the fouudation, but to the ſuperſtructure, but however, it doth not follow, that *laying on of hands* it ſelfe is a thing to continue, for he ſpeaks of it, but as of a doctrine, as that of *Baptiſmes*, which we confeſſe doth continue, as the *doctrine* of the *figures*, *types*, *ceremonies and ſacrifices* doth continue to this day: and the Apoſtle opened them largely in that Epiſtle, yet the figures themſelves were not to continue. Beſides, how do they prove that this *laying on of hands* is *ordination*, and not that uſed in confirmation? Here they miſerably ſtick, only they alledge it is ceaſed among many, and is not ſo neceſſary, but how prove they, that it is not as neceſſary? Shew us, where it is repealed, more then the other, ſeing it was as generally practiſed, yea and more, for many received it, that were not preachers nor elders.

In the laſt place, they plead, *that Preachers ſhould have a miantainance*, which we deny not, if they need it, but may not men be Preachers, who need no ſupply from others? but many have wherewith to be hoſpitable unto others, without taking, farre laſſe forceing others to give them: the maintainance then that we are againſt, is 1. A ſuperfluous and unneceſſary mantainance. 2. A forced maintainance. 3. Such a maintainance as Preachers agree with, and contract for. 4. A taking it from them, who are not worthy. 5. A taking it from them, who do not acknowledge them to be true Preachers. Now none of all the Scriptures or reaſons brought by them, prove any

ſuch maintainance, nor do we read that ever the Apoſtles received it, or that they received any tithes, which was the maintainance of the *Law*, and not of the *Goſpell*. and that the people ought to contract with preachers, will not follow, becaus they are bound in charity to ſupply their wants, for we are bound in charity to ſupply the wants of the poor, according to our ability, yet it doth not follow, that we are to contract with them, or that they can force it from us. As for the words of Chriſt, *freely giv*, as they import, that they were not to make ſale of the Goſpell, ſo alſo that they were not to force, or compell men to give them, any thing as a recompenſe for preaching the ſame, for how can we *give freely*, that which we force others to recompenſe us for? And here they cry out upon the Q. as a ſacrilegious crew, for denying ſuch unlawfull maintaintainance, as the Prieſts generally have. it ſeemes the youug men are greatly concerned, they love ſo wel *the wages of unrighteouſneſſe*, for againſt no other thing do we contend. Againe, they alledge, that we *belye them, in ſaying, they think that the preaching of the Goſpell can be ſold for any earthly wages*; the reaſon they give is weak, for although there is a vaſt diſproportion and inequality in worth betwixt the ſame, yet a thing may be ſold for leſſe then the worth of it, yea when the worth is infinitly greater, for did not Judas ſell Chriſt *for thirty pieces of ſilver*, and do not they plead that greedy and covetous men ought to be received, and payed, untill diveſted, and are not ſuch guilty of ſimony, and ſelling of preaching, which they confeſſe themſelves? therefore the Q. in this do not belye them. Yea do they not wel know that it is a moſt ordinary thing in young men (and it is wel if ſome of theſe be not guilty of the ſame) to goe unto patrons, and offer them money for preſentations unto parish churches, then which we know no greater ſimony uſed in the church of *Rome*? And as for the *hoſpitality* of *Preachers*, it is alſo required in *Deacons*, and *all good Chriſtians*, will it therefore follow, that all good Chriſtians muſt have *ſet ſtipends*, or if Chriſtians are to work with their hands, that they may have wherewith to be hoſpitable, why may not preachers alſo? They cite Paul, *telling that he had power to forbear working*, but they know that Paul was an Apoſtle, and claimed that power, not as an ordinary preacher, but as an Apoſtle, like unto the other Apoſtles, marke theſe words, for as touching the Apoſtles, they had that power, becaus of a more univerſall charge incumbent upon them, then ordinary paſtors, ſo that they could not ſo attend to work with their hands, as

others

others could, and yet even Paul wrought with his hands, which is more, then any of the Nationall teachers will doe, to ſpare the receiviug from them who are not able. And it is to be *obſerved*, how the nationall teachers plead ſtoutly, for their forbearing of working, from the power of the Apoſtles, but when we tell them, that the Apoſtles travelled from one nation to another, and took great paines to plant the Goſpell in many places, and hazarded their lives to preach it among the *heathens*; they *anſwer*, that is not required of them: ſo *they would take the Apoſtles to* patroniſe *them, in forbearing working, and taking maintainance*, but not *in being at ſuch paines and jeopardies for the Goſpells ſake, as the Apoſtles*, which is not equall. Alſo when we tell them, *the Apoſtles preached by inſpiration, and had an immediat call from heaven*, they tell us, *that is ceaſed now*: but why tell they not that the power to forbear working is ceaſed alſo? Surely the continuing of inſpirations, and immediat calls to the *Miniſtry* ſeemeth a more needfull thing, then *their ſtipends*.

SECTION EIGHTH.

of LIBERTY of CONSCIENCE,

Wherein the Students ſixth Section concerning the *Civil Magiſtrate his power in punishing of hereticks*, And alſo what they ſay in their eighth Section concerning *the tendency of Quakeriſm to Anarchie and treaſon, and denying the neceſsity of Chriſtianity*, is conſidered and anſwered.

After that the Students have laboured what they can to overturne the Quakers, they betake them to *Perſecution* as their laſt refuge, thinking if they can but prevaill here and get the Magiſtrats to cut off the Q. as blaſphemers and traitours (for ſuch they have deſigned them in their title page) they will be eaſed of the troubleſome task of diſputing any more with them. And here, not to be unlike themſelves, they begin with a lye, ſaying, *they had a diſpute concerning this with the Q. the 1. of Jun* 1675. whereas one of them, *to wit* I. L. was not preſent, and the other two propoſed not one argument in that matter, but what

was ſpoken, was by another, who being earneſtly deſired by them to concurre in the *Accompt* of it with them, utterly refuſed; as judging, neither he, nor they could give a *true account* of it, and abſolutely diſcharging to meddle with that in their book, which yet they are not aſhamed falſely to aſcribe to themſelves, which that young man upon ſight of their book from one of us, declared to be a lye, aſſerting what is above written in this matter, before ſeverall witneſſes of their owne profeſſion, particularly P. D. one of the Students atteſtators; and therefore ſince he judgeth himſelfe, as he declared, abuſed in this effaire by them, as wel as we, we ſhall not take notice of what paſſed at that time betwixt him and us, (it being alſo his deſire) but betake our ſelves to this *Theam*, as it is now propoſed and urged by the Students, wherein how miſerably they are pained, the very ſtating of their controverſie ſhewes, in which they have given away their cauſe. 1. They ſay, *they ſpeak only of reall hereſies, and not what others call ſo.* 2. they ſay, *they ſpeak not of inward acts and meer exerciſes of the mind, becaus it belongs neither to church, nor magiſtrat, to judge of hidden things.* To which we anſwer, that ſince the Students acknowledge that both their Church and magiſtrat is lyable to errour, yea and that neither of them, are to be ſuppoſed infallible, and therefore can not certainly and infallibly diſcerne what is hereſie, neither ought they to take upon them to punish for hereſie; and that *de facto* Proteſtant churches have thus erred, their maſter, *John Menzies* and many of his brethren, can bear witneſſe, who have cryed out againſt that for errour, antichriſtianity and hereſie, cauſing men to be grievouſly perſecuted for it, which now they allow as Chriſtian and Orthodox. But we ſhall improve this more hereafter, and now proceed to their arguments. 1. They argue from *Deut.* 13 : 5. *Exod.* 22 : 20. *Lev.* 22. but the queſtion is, whether theſe commands given particularly to the *Iewes*, belong to us (for that of *Lev.* 22. is only concerniug the *Prieſts* and *Levits*, touching the holy things, with their uncleanneſſe upon them, and is wholly impertinent to this purpoſe) for if theſe be obligatory upon us, ſo will alſo many other, as that a man may immediatly with his owne hand *kill him, that has killed his kinſman, unleſſe he get to the city of refuge*, ſeing there is no particular repeal of that, more then of the former, yea and that of *Deut.* 5 : 9. ſaith expreſſly that *the brother, husband or father of him that conſenteth to ſerve other Gods, ſhall kill him with his own hand*, which our adverſaries will not deny to be murder, and let them

ſhew

shew us where the one part of this command is repealed more, then the other, or how the one part is lawfull for us, and the other unlawfull, seing both were commanded and lawfull to the *Iewes*: for their meer assertions as to this pag: 126. are not to be regarded. They are offended that *Matth.* 5:29. should be given for a repeal of this, alledging *that belongeth only to private persons, and not to magistrats, else it should be unlawfull for Magistrats to punish transgressours* &c. Answ. The *Consequence* will not hold, for we are not speaking of things *civil*, but of things *religious*, though it may be lawfull for them, *to resist evil* in the one, yet not in the other. But that Christian magistrats are here included is easily proven. If this belong to all Christians, then it belongeth to all magistrats if they be Christians; for to say, that a Christian by becomeing a magistrat, is dispensed, of these obligations he is particularly tyed to, as a Christian, is most absurd, yea if Christian magistrats be bound to suffer for *righteousnesse sake*, then they are *not to resist evil* in matters of religion, But the first is true, for how could they enjoy the blessing of those that suffer for righteousnesse sake *Matth.* 5:10, 11. if they still resisted? At this rate none should suffer for Christ, who could by any means shun it, by killing those that make them suffer, and who would then be those that suffer willingly? and it seemes according to the Students, if a man be a magistrate, he ought not any more to suffer for Christ, which is as much as to say, that so soon as a man becomes a magistrate, he ceases to be a Christian.

The great noise they make of the two dispensations of the Gospell, mentioned by G. K. doth but manifest their owne weaknesse and folly, for themselves will not deny but that *wherever faith in Iesus Christ is professed, and he owned as the Saviour, and Son of God, there is a dispensation of the Gospell, as in the Greek, Armenian, Ethiopian, yea (and in their account) in the Romish church also*, yet will they not deny but that dispensation is *more legall and obscure*, , then that themselves are under, as having many ceremonies and shaddowes not necessary, and so here is a twofold dispensation acknowledged by themselves, seing they will not affirme that the use of all these ceremonies is absolutely sinfull in these churches, who are not as yet convinced of it, though it should be unlawfull for them to use them; and seing the purest and most excellent dispensation of the Gospell is to be like unto Christ, who *resisted not evil*, though he was powerfull to doe it, and that we are bound to be like him, then

there is a diſpenſation of the Goſpell, in which *evil is not to be reſiſted.* But further, if there be ſuch a diſpenſation of the Goſpell, as *men ſhall beat their ſwords into plough-ſhears, and their ſpears into pruning hooks, and not learne warre any more*, then there is a diſpenſation, in which *evil ſhall not be reſiſted*, the *conſequence* can not be denyed; the *antecedent* is the expreſſe words of the prophet Iſaiah 2. 4.. Beſides, this twofold diſpenſation is proved out of *bishop Forbes* of *Aberdeen* his expoſition upon the *Revelations*, where he affirmes that the two laſt chapters of the *Revelation*, is underſtood of a church upon earth, in which church it can not be ſuppoſed that evil should be reſiſted by an outward ſword.

Pag. 121. They argue from Rom. 13. where *the magiſtrat is not to bear the ſword in vain.* Hence they conclude, *they ought to reſiſt evil*, but this ſaith nothing as to matters of religion; they shew as wel their malice, as diſingenuity here, inſinuating, we denyed *that place to belong to Magiſtrats now*, which we never did, nor doe; only G. K. ſaid, he would be glad to hear how they could prove that it did belong to magiſtrats now, and indeed were we not other wayes perſwaded of it, their arguments could not in reaſon convince us, which is, that the Scripture is written for our cauſe, and theſe epiſtles are to be received and obeyed by us, but they have overturned all theſe themſelves (as is above obſerved) where in their anſwer to the Apoſtls rules, about *womens praying and propheſying with their head covered*; they ſuppoſe rules given by the Apoſtle in his epiſtles, of things, that not only are not pertaining to us, but even unlawfull, and ſo unleſſe they make us a clear diſtinction of theſe rules, and that by ſome evident demonſtration, to argue from our duty to obey theſe commands, ſignifies nothing. But while they take up the paper to prove, that which they can not ſay we ever denyed, they moſt shameleſſly omitt our chief anſwer to this, which could they have replyed unto, they would not have dropped thus. And therefore we shall returne it upon them, that they may not forget it, when they writ next. That of the 13 Rom. can not be underſtood of the magiſtrats punishing men for matters of Conſcience, becauſe, it being written to the church of Rome, to shew them, their duty towards their preſent magiſtrate, which was *Nero* that *cruell and perſecuting Emperour*, and then it would follow, that *Nero* had had a lawfull power, and authority, to punish even Chriſtians for errours in matters of religion, though himſelfe was a profeſſed infidel, and ſeing the magiſtrate is to exert his power, according to his know-

knowledge, it would follow that *Nero* exercised a lawfull power in causing kill the Apostles, and persecute the Christians, which will make that horrid crime very slender, seing it was no more according to the Stud. but the exercising that lawfull authority, he had received from God, according to his knowledge.

Pag. 122. They build an airy triumph upon their owne mistak, alledging, that since their magistrats are not under that pure dispensation, it is lawfull for them to resist evil, and so that of Matth. is not a repeal to them. But they have here either wilfully, or ignorantly forgotten the other branch of the distinction, for granting *their Magistrats* may (as we deny not) and that lawfully *resist evill in Civil matters*, yet *not in matters of Conscience*, and this is that, which was incumbent upon them to have proven. But it may be worth the Readers paines specially to notice their reasonings in this 122. p. in answer to that objection given in by us, from the parable of the *tares* Matth. 13. where the servants are expressly forbidden to pluck them up. Here they play fast and loose to purpose, and to facilitate their own work, make no difficulty to fasten contradictions upon Christ himselfe. 1. They say, *It is clearly repealed, becaus murtherers, witches, traitours are tares, as wel as hereticks; and if the one were to be eximed, so would the other.* Is not this the way to argue against Christ, and to charge contradictions upon him, not upon us? wherein they fasten an absurdity upon him, who gave this command, or else they must acknowledge, that by these *tares* are to be understood some sort of evil doers, with whom the magistrats, are not to meddle. But since the Students say, *this is repealed*, they must confesse it sometimes stood in vigour, it being once commanded, we would willingly be informed then of them, (and they may remember it, when they write next) how long this command stood, and to whom it belonged, since it had its rise from Christ, and was none of the old covenant precepts, or if it be one of these useless Gospell commands they dreame of, which it is unlawfull for us to obey. But to goe on, they say, *that by the tares is to be understood, bemasked hypocrits, who being scarce discernable from the wheat, are therefore not to be meddled with.* Very wel then, where the magistrate can not discerne heresies, according to themselves, he is not to punish: and then what comes of that authority was acknowledged *Nero* had, from Rom. 13 who was as uncapable to discerne hereticks as hypocrits? And then seing as before is said, *they are not to judge of hidden things, experience hath aboun-*

abundantly shewne, how much the true discerning of heresie is both uncertaine, and difficult even to Protestant magistrats, who have called that *wheat to day*, which they have called *tares to morrow*, and therefore ought *according to this rule, to forbear medling in such matters.*

Their second argument pag. 123. drawne from *Rom.* 13. and 1 *Pet.* 2: 14. which is parallel with it, is before answered. Afterwards they goe about to play the *Politittians*, shewing both here, and in the following pag. how *the publick peace is disturbed, by suffering of sundry Religions*, and this they reckon so certain, that they conclude *it is known by all, that are but indifferently versed in histories* &c. Now if this conclusion hold true, it is impossible either for *France*, *Germany*, *Holland* or *Zwitserland* to be in peace, without either the *Papists* rise up, and cutt the *Protestants* throats, or the *Protestants* theirs, and who but such as the Studeuts can be ignorant that after much blood-shed and contention, who should oppresse and destroy each other, they have learned by sad experience, that it is safest, and most conducible to the peace, and contributs most to the publick benefit, not to meddle with each others consciences, notwithstanding that these pitifull Statesmen can prattle to the contrary, who have shewne themselves in this to be very indifferently versed in history.

But they proceed affirming, that *since the Magistrat is keeper of both tables, to whom is entrusted not only the care of mens bodies, but souls, he ought to punish not only for evil, but also for religious offences.* If all this were confessed, would it follow that he were to punish Religious, as Civil offences by a Civil censure? Surely nay, no more then he must punish Civile offences, by an Ecclesiastick censure. Now it remains for them to prove that offences in things purely conscientious should among Christians be punished by the externall sword, which they have not as yet done, and let it be here observed, that not withstanding all their clamours for *the Magistrats priviledge, and that the Q. detract from him*, that all the *power, dignity and honour* they put upon him, is to be the *Clergies burrow*, for as they allow *him not authority to judge who are Hereticks, and who not, but he must only serve to be their executioner*, and persecut such as they find prejudiciall to their intereſt, for though they will have it to be lawfull for Preachers, such as their *Bishops*, to be *Magistrats*, as *Chancellour, Counseller, Iudge*, &c. Yet no *Magistrat*, nay the *King himself must take upon him to be a Preacher*, (though we could never see any thing in

in all the New Teſtament, making this unlawfull, yea and David and Solomon in the Old, who were not of the tribe of *Levi*, were both Prophets and Preachers, and pen-men of the Scripture) This trick even the *Proteſtant Clergy* have learned from their father the *Pope*, who shewed the *Clergy* long ago, the way to make themſelves *Princes and Iudges*, but to be ſure to *shut out the Magiſtrate from meddling with their function*. So it may be eaſily ſeen here, whether the Q. or the Students be greateſt friends to the *Magiſtrate*. Laſtly, They *conclude*, *that ſince thoſe that broach hereſy, do evil, and that the Magiſtrate is the executer of God's wrath upon him that doeth, or acteth outwardly evil, without any reſtriction* &c. *it is not lawfull for us to add a reſtriction, where the Spirit of God hath put none.*

Who can but admire *the impudency of theſe Students*, which doe that, which in the following line they affirme is unlawfull, by adding [*outwardly*] which is a reſtriction? For the words in the text are not [*outwardly evil*] but *evil*, which being taken without any reſtriction, comprehends inward as wel as outward acts of evil. Seing then they put a reſtriction, (though to their own ſelfe-condemnation, they confeſſe it to be unlawfull) which they are forced to doe, elſe hypocrites would be comprehended, whom they *confeſſe to be tares, that are not to be meddled with.* We that judge it no wiſe unlawfull (becaus without other clear texts be contradicted, there muſt be here a reſtriction) may reſtrict it to things *civil* and *morall*, excluding matters of worship and difference in opinion, for the reaſons often before mentioned. Their 3. argument wholly miſſes the matter, *which is the practice of many princes, even approved of God, in coërcing Idolatries* &c: for ſince all the examples, they give, are of the kings of Judah and Iſraël under the, Law it nowiſe meets the preſent controverſie, which is concerning the power of Chriſtian Magiſtrats under the Goſpell.

Laſtly, They argue *that the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, have propheſied that it should be the office of Chriſtian Magiſtrats to coërce falſe prophets*, for which they alledge *Deut.* 18: 20. *he that shall ſpeak in the name of other Gods shall die.* Very wel, he ſaith not, ſhall be put to death in a judiciall way. It is ſaid, *The ſoul that ſinneth shall die*, it will not therefore follow, that every ſoul that ſinneth, ſhall be killed by the Magiſtrate. But though it be underſtood of putting to death, it reacheth not the caſe, we being under the Goſpell, not under the Law, where alſo it was not

lawfull so to doe for different opinions and interpretations of the Law, but onely for rejecting the true God, and his Law, and introducing new and strange Gods Their other proofe is from Zech. 13: 1, 2, &c: where it is said, that *the fathers and the mothers of the false Prophets shall say unto them, Thou shalt not live, and thrust them through, when they prophesy.* This is so farre from being taken literally, that the Students dare not take it so themselves, else the father and and the mother might doe the businesse without troubling the magistrate, and afterwards the text speaks of those, *who were not to live,* of their having *wounds in their hands and being alive*, which shewes the understanding here is to be spirituall, and seing the Students do not understand it literally, of the persons to whom the text ascribes this coërcing, and that there is not the least word of a magistrate in the place, for them, to affirme, that it is not to be understood of the magistrate, is but miserably to begg the question. They begin their 8. *Sect.* pag. 126. affirming that *Quakerism tends to Anarchie and confusion and treason*, alledging, *we would pull down the Magistrate, if we could, and set up our own spirituall Magistrates, as Iohn of Leyden* &c. For this malitious insinuation they give no reason, but such an one as destroyes it, *to wit*, our giving in [*Resist not evil, pluck not up the tares*] *as repeals of some lawes in the Old Test.* Now let men of reason, judge, whether *treason* be the *tendency* of *these mens principles*, that affirme, *evil is not to be resisted*; or how these can doe violence to the Magistrate without contradicting their principles, and then it can not be the tendency of them: and wheras they conclude, saying, *That Quakerism, as they conceive, beyond all doubt, tends to Anarchie, confusion of state and treason.* Their conceptions are very false, in this matter, and we may upon farr better grounds retort this upon the Students *Confraternity*, the *Clergy*, who through their ambition and turbulency did from the pulpits blow the trumpet of all the late confusion, and treason, in the civil warrs, and shew themselves exact disciples of *Iohn. of Leyden*, acting his pranks upon the stage of Great Britaine, a charge, they have not to lay to the Quakers.

Their next effort is to prove, *we deny the necessity of Professing Christianity, becaus we believe those not bound to believe the history of Christ, from whom God hath necessarily withheld the knowledge of it*, for they confesse that wee believe these obliged to believe them, to whom they are revealed. But they must here also act like themselves, in makeing that a horrible crime in us, which their owne chiefe doctors affirme, who being

being preſſed by the Arminians with this argument [*That which every man is bound to believe is true. But every man is bound to believe that Chriſt died for them, therfor it is true*] They deny the *Minor* plainly affirming that thoſe that have not heard of Chriſt, are *not bound to believe he died for them*, ſo according to the Students themſelves, are guilty of denying the neceſſity of profeſſing Chriſtianity as well as we. But further they ſay, *weeare guilty of this, becaus we ſet up a new Chriſt in every man, that is borne, and growes up, unto a perfect ſubſtantiall birth*, as their firſt charge in this matter hitts at their owne Doctors, ſo this ſecond is common with us to the Apoſtle Paul (for the Students diſpute like blind men ſtriking at random, that heed not, what they hit) ſeing the Apoſtle calls *Chriſt within*, of which we ſpeak, *the hope of glory*, which is neither a *new Chriſt*, nor yet another then *he that died at Ieruſalem* who did travell that *he* might be *brought forth in the Galatians*, and calls him, *the new man, borne in, and put on by others*. So if in this the Apoſtle did not deny the outward ſufferings of Chriſt, neither doe we; unleſſe the Students can ſhew, how our doctrine differs from his, or contradicts it, which they have not yet attempted to doe. As for that queſtion of *I. Penington. How can outward blood cleanſe?* we referre them to his owne book in defence of that expreſſion, as quarrelled by J. Hicks, called *the flesh and blood of Chriſt, of which there were divers printed coppies at Aberdeen, befor the Students book was put to the preſſe.*

The CONCLUSION.

Wherin their obſervations upon *R. B.* his *Offer*, and their laſt Section of the *Q. Revileings*, as they term them, are examined.

IN the end of the account of our diſpute, I renewed an offer to the preachers of Aberdeen, as being the perſons, we were principally concerned withall, giving the reaſons therfore, and ſhewing the good effects, that might proceed therefrom, as in the ſame offer may be ſeen; at this the Stud. ſeeme to have gone mad, and fret and fume, like perſons poſſeſſed, alledging, *I betake my ſelfe to railing as my laſt refuge*;

but whether there be any railing in that Offer, is left to the judicious Reader to examine. The Students notwithstanding their clamours, give not one instance of it, but whether they have any better reason to answer it withall, then railing, let the Reader judge. For upon this occasion, pag. 127. 128. they call *me vaine and arrogant, like a very Thraso, ignorant and foolish, one whose weakenesse and ignorance is renowned, a bold barker, but a soft biter.* These are the modest young men, that professe to be against railing, that say in their Preface, they *have abstained from personall criminations, and have not rendred evil for evil*, and with this their unreasonable railling they mix in a company of lyes, as that insinuation, as if the Theses had been written by G. K. which is a false calumny, they are dared to prove: Like unto which is what follows, *that I provoked all Europe, sought dispute in divers places from any who would without distinction, upon the account of this printed provocation, boasted and gloried that I had got no dispute*; which containe as many lyes almost as words, for which, they offer not the least proofe. Afterwards as an instance of my cowardlynesse and vain boasting; they say, *I with G. K. fled, and deserted a dispute appointed betwixt us and R. G. my uncle, at the Crosse of Elgin*, which is utterly false; neither G. K. nor I ever spake with R. G. about such a matter, nor made any appointment with him: yea R. G. hath under his hand declared, that being by a friend of his desired, he refused to debate with us, in relation to these *Theses*, nor was there any such appointment ever made known to us: So the *Reader* may see whether these credible witnesses, that attested their *Accompt*, be any better here then those credible informers, from whom they had this great untruth. As they proceed, they give themselves the lye, for after many needlesse words, of which it is hard to make sense, they conclude *that this late engagement* (meaning the dispute with themselves) *is a fulfilling of the offer in the end of the English Theses*, notwithstanding they subscribed the *Articles*, whereof the first expressly bears, *that it is abstract from it.*

But first they say, *The Ministers are not concerned to meet with the Quebecaus, the report of the victory is already gone upon their side, who are but young men, and can not doe so wel as their ministers who are more learned, and grave*; and yet a little after, that they may not omitt here to give themselves the lye, they say, *that such a dispute would be a means to stumble the weake, harden the fallen, and dishonour God, rather then the contrary.* What confusion is here! *they are but young men, and their*

Masters

Masters more learned, grave and able, their dispute (if they be to be believed) *has done good, established many inclining to Quakerism, and yet their Ministers disputing would be a mean to stumble the weake &c.* They conclude that we are not to be sought after, *becaus we are goats and wolves and not strayed sheep*; we could produce enough under their Masters hands to contradict this, if it were worth the paines. They fill up the rest of the *Sect* with alledging *that publick disputs are against the Law, upbraiding me as a rebell for offering one*, alledging that it is not lawfull for Protestants neither in the *Turkish* nor *Popish* dominions to offer to dispute against the publick religion authorized by the Magistrate, though they may privatly call it in question, and disswade from it: whereby they openly condemne as rebells, the Apostles and primitive Christians, yea and the primitive Protestants, as by many instances both at home, and abroad, could be shewne: and whereas they say, *we professe to oppose their religion, and not Papists*, it is another falshood, for some of us of late years, have lost their lives, and others deeply suffered, for opposing *Popery* at *Rome* it selfe, a task, the Students so long as they can sit at ease, and buy a benefice at home, will as unwillingly undertake, as another dispute with the Qu.

They b[illegible] their last Sect. most impudently, alledging, that they *have past by, as much as they could, personall criminations*: how great a lye this is, the Reader by what is above said, will observe, They are angry we should alledge, that *their Masters had put arguments into their mouths*, though we can shew them, of the closest of them in manuscripts sent by them to us; and to disprove this, they say, *they faithfully declare it to be lyes.* But what men of faith they are is above shewne: let it be left to the Reader to judge whether they be more to be trusted, in saying, the arguments they brought, were their owne, then when they say, they *had a dispute with the Q. the* 1. *of June* 1675, though one of them was altogether absent, and the other two were but meer hearers: what reason is there, they should be believed in saying, the arguments they used were their owne, though perhaps they only repeated them, as when they positively affirmed that they disputed with us, though they were meere auditors? And to this they add another great lye, saying, *that the Q. affirmed in their Contra-remonstrance that this is G. Ms. work under their cover*, whereas the words are, *It is strange, that they*, (to wit, the Stud.) *should undertake so hastily, what he has been so long advising, unlesse this*

be his work under their cover; but a ſuppoſition is not a poſitive aſſertion: It is not ſaid, *this is his work*, as the Stud. have perverted it, who are ſo accuſtomed to lye, that ſuch kind of perverſions paſſe with them, but for ſmall eſcapes. They are offended W. M. ſhould be called a *Catechiſt*, (though the Biſhop their Ordinary is not pleaſed he ſhould have a higher deſignation, and themſelves can not deny it) and whereas they ſay, *This is done exceeding malitiouſly, for he officiated at the foreſaid place for a short ſpace, and long before the publiſhing of their pamphlet*: they would doe wel to ſhew wherein the malice of this lieth, and to examine whether he did not exerciſe that office longer then he has done any time; but it is their cuſtome to ſpeak at randome.

They cry out againſt our ſaying, *we were informed, that their maſter had gone to the B. to deſire him to complain to the Councill, &c.* alledging that *though we ſay, we are informed, yet they inſinuate it is a lye, of our making. Becaus it is uſuall for us that are damnable Hereticks, to ſpread a falſe report our ſelves, and then ſay, we heard it.* Let them inſtance any report, if they can, raiſed up by us, for which we cannot give them Authors of their owne Religion, wheras the moſt part of their reports againſt us, have no authors but our enemies. But for anſwer, let them know, that the ſame was told to *R. B.* by *G. M.* and *I. S.* two chiefe Citizens of their owne Profeſſion, the laſt of which, conſtrained him to ſtand upon the ſtreet untill he ſhould tell it him, And wheras they add, that *if they would follow our footſteps they could caſt many horrid things in our teeth*, Anſw. it is one thing to receive information againſt a people, and report things as true, ſpoken or written by their profeſſed enemies, as the Students doe in their citations out of *Clerks* examples, *Hicks* and *Faldo*: and another to report things ſpoken by members of their owne Church, who if they have belyed them, let them reckon that among themſelves. Laſtly, They accuſe me, *as having impudently aſperſed their Profeſſor I. M. with ſcurrilous revileings, and malitious calumnies*, of which, they are ſo impudent, as not to give one inſtance, and are thereto dared, when they write next, to name them, or inſtance one calumny or ſcurrilous revileing, wherwith I aſperſe him, or elſe be accounted impudent lyars, wheras they ſay *theſe calumnies we borrowed from the ſpitefull Ieſuits, and like vipers, ſpouted* them out. Again, they declare their folly, The Jeſuit accuſed him of treaſon, as the Students, following his example, doe us, but ſo not I, who only minded him, that ſeing he who

ſayes

ſayes the Scripture is his Rule, has been deceived, in pretending the Scripture ſaid, that which now he confeſſes to be an errour. If the Spirit were to be rejected from being the rule, becaus men pretending to it, have been deceived: ſo should the Scripture alſo, in which inſtances, if he or they dare ſay, I have calumniated him, let them name wherin. And I shall prove all I have aſſerted in that affaire, and that without recurring to the Jeſuits teſtimony, having my information from better hands. And to augment their lyes, they ſay, *It tends to his advantage; to be calumniated by ſuch as the Quakers*: They have not proved that we have calumniated him, and we may juſtly retort. That he may rather be troubled and shamed to find himſelfe ſo fawningly flattered and commended by ſuch as the Stud. like the Philoſopher of old, that was troubled when ſpoken well of by a profligat perſon.

Laſtly, They goe about to Apologize *for the long time, their book hath been a comeing out becaus of their difficulties at the preſſe*, which difficulties were not ſuch as we meet with; to have their papers ſurprized and ſtopt, as they ſought to doe ours. But becaus they could not perſwade a Printer to be ſo foolish, as to print them, without due payment, but it is like, the contriving and patching it together, hath been as great a cauſe of lett, ſince when it was out, and came from *Edinburgh* to *Aberdeen*, and after we had bought one intire book at *Edinburgh*, They kept it up at Aberdeen ſeverall weeks, adviſeing and conſulting about it, and upon notice of ſome groſſe contradictions in it, which wee had obſerved to ſome of their owne way, They cauſed the Printer there to patch two pages to it, to help them, by which, they have but rendered their weakneſſe more obvious. For whereas to ſolve that groſſe contradiction before obſerved by us, of their making us ſpeak in their *Accompt*, one after another, and yet ſaying, the Auditors can teſtifie, that we are lyars, and never ſpake ſo, They ſay, *their meaning is not, that we did not ſpeak, one after another*. What means the word *never* then? This Apology amounts to no more, but that the Students intended not to contradict themſelves, and inſtead of bettering themſelves by this addition, they have given away their cauſe, for whereas they before make a great clamour againſt *G. K.* for aſſerting permiſſive inſpirations, as if it had been ſome great abſurdity, themſelves here affirm the ſame thing, ſaying, The Apoſtle by theſe words, *it is good for a man not to touch a woman, doth not command but only permitt, (he himſelf neverth eleſſe being inſpired by the Spirit of God ſo to do)* is not this then a per-

permiſſive inſpiration? So that theſe things will but make their folly manifeſt, as alſo their further frivolous Apologies in that additionall advertiſement, which to the truely judicious doth not cover but rather diſcover their weakneſſe.

Seing it may fall out that this tract may arrive at the hands of many who perhaps may not ſee thoſe sheets in which we have diſproved the Students calumnies and lyes in matter of fact, as in Relation to the diſpute wee had with them, we thought fit here alſo to inſert the certificate of four Students preſent at the diſpute, and ſince come among us, three of which were at that time actuall Students of Philoſophy in the Univerſity, and the other had been in the claſſe with one of the diſputants. R. B.

Wee under-ſubſcribers late Students of Philoſophy from the univerſity of Aberdeen being preſent at the Diſpute doe faithfully declare that the Students have groſely belyed the Qu. in their Accompt, makeing them ſpeake that which they ſpake not and alſo forging arguments and anſwers not mentioned upon the place. And though wee had no intention at that time to owne the people called Qu yet wee dare not but declare that their Anſwers and behaviour had no ſmall influence upon us, to make us in love with their way, and to ſearch after it more diligently: as alſo the Students arguments and lightneſſe did not a litle tend to make us diſguſt them and their principles, and albeit that inward peace and ſatisfaction of mind, which wee enjoy in the Truth wee now profeſſe with that deſpiſed and injured people, doth make us bleſſe the day in which it pleaſed God to bring us among them; yet wee are not a litle confirmed in the beliefe of this reproached teſtimony and witneſſes, that wee find the ſtrongeſt arguments their Adverſaries have againſt them, are lyes and calumnies, And this wee teſtifie for the Truth, whom the Truth hath taught not to lye.

ROBERT SANDILANDS.
JAMES ALEXANDER.

And I alſo declare, who (being a Student at that time, in the old town Colledge) was preſent at the Diſpute, and heard the ſame with attention, that the Students have groſſly belyed the Q. in many things in their account, and although that ſince, it hath pleaſed God to joine me unto that people, yet at that time I had no mind to be of their way, However when I ſaw their account I did approve it, as ingenuous, as now alſo I doe, and diſapprove the Students as falſe in many things.

ALEXANDER SEATONE.

And I likwiſe (being a Student in the new town Colledge) at that time, was preſent at the Diſpute and doe declare, that the Students folly and lightneſſe had no ſmall influence upon me, to ſearch more narrowly into the way of that people, which it pleaſed the Lord to bleſſe unto me, ſo that the eyes of my underſtanding came to be opened, and I came fully to be convinced of the truth of their principles and way, to which now by the mercy and goodneſſe of the Lord, I am joyned, and do find, by comparing the two Accounts together, that the Students have wronged the people called Quakers in divers things, as the Students ſelf contradictions do ſufficiently ſhew.

ALEXANDER PATERSONE.

Universal Love CONSIDERED,

And established upon its Right Foundation.

BEING,

A serious enquiry how far Charity may and ought to be extended towards persons of different Judgments in matters of

RELIGION.

AND

Whose Principles among the several Sects of Christians do most naturally lead to that due moderation required.

Writ in the Spirit of Love and Meekness, for the removing of Stumbling-blocks out of the Way of the Simple; by a lover of the Souls of all Men.

Robert Barclay.

1 Joh. 4. 16. *God is Love, and he that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in God.*

1 Jo. 5. 2. *For this is the Love of God, that we keep his Commandements.*

Printed in the Year, 1677.

110. f. 240. (9)